



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2019

No. 168

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RUSH).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 23, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BOBBY L. RUSH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### NFL SHOULD END RACIST EXPLOITATION OF NATIVE AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the National Football League is celebrating its 100th anniversary, and its popularity and economic success is indisputable. Millions of fans watched the NFL last year, and the league's 32 teams split more than \$16 billion in revenue.

One team, the Washington franchise, exploits a racist slur and a racist mas-

cot that insults and demeans Native Americans to help generate profits for the NFL owners.

In the 21st century, we should rightly condemn the use of racial slurs that disparage African Americans, Latinos, Asians, or anyone. And there is no doubt about it. The term "redskin," in fact, was used in conjunction with scalp hunting in the 19th century.

In 1863, in Winona, Minnesota, my home State, a newspaper, the Winona Daily Republican, printed an announcement: "The State reward for dead Indians has been increased to \$200 for every redskin sent to purgatory. This sum is more than the dead bodies of all the Indians east of the Red River are worth."

A news story published in the Atchison Daily Champion in Atchison, Kansas, on October 9, 1985, told the stories of settlers' "hunt for redskins, with a view of obtaining their scalps."

No doubt about it, this is a negative word. This is a slur. So it is remarkable that the NFL commissioners and owners continue to sanction the racist and shameful use of the term "redskin" to describe Native Americans and then profit from it.

There are millions of Native Americans in this country whose ancestors endured forced removal from their lands, suppression of their culture, and state-sponsored campaigns of ethnic cleansing.

The NFL racist mascot mocks this painful history.

Tomorrow night, the Washington team and its racist mascot will be in Minnesota, the home of 11 proud sovereign Tribal nations. I will be joining Tribal leaders, elected officials, and other Minnesotans gathering outside the stadium. We will be speaking out against racism and exploitation. We will stand proudly with our Native American brothers and sisters. With one voice, we will be calling on the NFL to end its racist exploitation of

Native Americans and to do one thing: Change the mascot.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS H. TRACY, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Tom Tracy, Jr., an active and beloved community member who passed away unexpectedly last month at the age of 47.

Tom grew up in Ivesdale, Illinois. After graduating from Bement High School, he went on to attend Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and earned his MBA from Eastern Illinois University.

He spent over two decades working in the banking industry before accepting the role of president and CEO of Farm Credit Illinois in 2015. In this position, he led an organization of 220 full-time employees and a multibillion-dollar loan portfolio for its farm owners.

Those who worked closely with him described Tom as an extraordinary executive with a kind and charitable heart.

Outside of work, Tom showed he grew up in Bement and learned how to actually get involved in his community to make it better. Tom gave generously to Parkland College. He gave generously to local charities, and he served on the board of Kirby Medical Center's Kirby Foundation in Monticello. Tom lived his entire life in humble service to his friends, to his neighbors, and to his family.

He was a kind young man. Tom's life was full of promise. He is truly going to be missed.

Shannon and I are deeply saddened by his passing, and our prayers are with all those who knew Tom, all those who worked with Tom, but especially

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8391

his wife, Erin, and his children, Alex and Maggie.

Rest in peace, my friend.

#### HONORING THE HONORABLE LOU FREY, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor former Congressman Lou Frey, who represented the Orlando area in this Chamber for a decade, from 1969 to 1979.

He passed away recently but leaves behind an enduring legacy. Congressman Frey was many things, but above all, he was a loving husband, a wonderful father and grandfather, and an extraordinary public servant who cared deeply about central Florida and about this country.

He was a man with strongly held views, but also one willing to make principled compromises in the interest of bipartisan progress. His accomplishments before, during, and after his tenure in Congress are too long to list, but their impact can be summarized like this: Because of him, Orlando is a better city; Florida is a better State; and America is a better Nation.

As the chair of Future Forum, a group dedicated to empowering young people, I regard Lou Frey as a role model. One of his most passionate causes was helping younger Americans learn about this country, about how our government works, and about how choosing a career in public service can bring you a sense of inner joy and enable you to improve the lives of others.

Lou, working with former Senator Bob Graham, was instrumental in getting Florida to pass legislation requiring all students in the State to complete civics education. When I saw how young Floridians responded in the wake of the Pulse and Parkland shootings, turning those tragedies into a resolute call for government action, I thought of and silently thanked Lou Frey.

Rest in peace, Congressman.

#### PROTECT AMERICA FROM FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. I rise in strong support of the SHIELD Act. I helped introduce this legislation, and the House will consider it on the floor later today.

This bill will protect our country from foreign interference in our elections. Russia's assault on our democracy in 2016 exposed gaps in our Nation's defenses.

It used to be that the primary threat from adversary nations was their potential use of traditional weapons of war. But our society is rapidly changing and so is the nature of conflict.

Today, our enemies are far more likely to use computer malware than cruise missiles to do us harm, and they don't think twice about exploiting loopholes in our laws in order to influence our elections.

That is why passing the SHIELD Act is so critical to maintaining the foundation of our democracy, our system of free and fair elections.

We know Russia and possibly other foreign powers will likely use similar tactics in 2020. And why wouldn't they? Russia has suffered almost no consequences for their actions in 2016.

While Russia assisted a Republican on that occasion, it could aid a Democrat in the future. That is because Moscow's loyalty is to itself, not to any U.S. political party. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should never forget that fact.

To defend our democracy, we need to act now to protect our elections. We need to pass the SHIELD Act.

I commend Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership in drafting this critical piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

#### WORDS OF PRESIDENT ZELENSKY HAVE BEEN IGNORED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, an overlooked factor of these relentless investigations and this impeachment inquiry is the way in which the words of Ukrainian President Zelensky have been largely ignored.

Zelensky said, without condition, that he felt no pressure from President Trump related to corruption investigations in Ukraine. President Zelensky's words have been largely ignored because they do not fit the narrative pushed by the Democratic leadership of this House.

Just think, had President Zelensky wanted to severely damage our President, he could have lied and stated he did feel pressure. Doesn't that scenario give you chills? Had a foreign leader simply altered and fabricated one publicly stated phrase, the entire Democratic Caucus of this House would be calling for our President's head, repeating it over and over.

That is the reality of this sickening and dangerous presumption of guilt that some Members of this body are choosing to push.

Our President deserves nothing less than the due process and presumption of innocence afforded to all Americans by our Constitution. Anything less is an affront to the Republic our Founders created and to all the electorate, Democratic and Republican.

#### RECOGNIZING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND TURKISH INVASION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a concerned American, concerned because our country stands at a crossroads in foreign policy and history, I might add.

In recent days, we have seen this administration cynically abandon our Kurdish allies in northeast Syria and open the door to a Turkish invasion. These decisions were made without consulting our allies, our distinguished diplomats, and regional experts like Ambassador Jeffrey.

Much damage has been done. Yesterday, President Putin and President Erdogan signed an agreement, I believe, that harms American interests in that part of the world.

Hundreds of people have been killed. Tens of thousands have been displaced. Dangerous ISIS prisoners, who have been killing and wounding Americans, are now on the loose, threatening increased international terrorist actions in Europe and the United States. This is a real threat.

Turkey's actions have shown it to be a dangerous actor on the international stage, but it is not the first time. We must immediately impose sanctions to show our commitment to a stable international order and the rule of law, and Turkey must understand that.

Clearly, the international reputation of the United States has, I think, been deeply damaged.

As chairman of the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue, I know. Our European partners ask me all the time: Are we together? Do we share the same values of the rule of law, of democratic freedoms?

The United States should never, ever end up standing alone. The past few days also reminds us of another injustice that must be rectified.

In 1915, the Ottoman Empire embarked upon systematic deportation of 1.5 million Armenians. These innocent men, women, and children became the first genocide in the 20th century. Yet, as I stand here this morning, the brutal atrocity has still not received the official recognition by our government that it deserves.

□ 1015

Turkey outrageously continues to ignore the voices of the survivors and the descendants around the world. Many of these survivors settled in my district in the San Joaquin Valley where they have lived and where they have raised their children in the blessings of liberty, and they made it in the American way.

But this is not justice. The road to justice begins with full recognition of the Armenian people's suffering. Both Turkey and the United States, immediately, should recognize that the Armenian genocide occurred, as the European Union has done.

I am proud to support H. Res. 296 which, over the objections of Ankara, would establish permanent U.S. recognition and ongoing American remembrance of the Armenian genocide. That is the right thing to do.

I call upon my colleagues who have yet to publicly endorse this bipartisan resolution to join me, with over 110 co-sponsors, in calling for a long-overdue

passage by the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the horrors of the Armenian genocide can never ever be undone. Words alone cannot comfort those who suffered nor dry the tears of another mother or grandmother who has lost her children or grandchildren. By acknowledging the suffering of the victims through the official recognition of the Armenian genocide, we can at least ensure that future generations will never ever forget this atrocity to mankind.

#### ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the growing serious threat to our democracy and the interference in elections of foreign adversaries. Yes, these things are all related.

With the 2020 elections fast approaching, now is the time to take action by supporting the SHIELD Act. The SHIELD Act puts four commonsense bipartisan reforms to improve our defenses against anyone meddling in our elections. No one should do that, and every American should take issue. It closes loopholes, strengthens reporting requirements, restricts exchange of information between campaigns, and limits any involvement with foreign agents.

As public officials, we raise our hand to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. We must rise to this occasion to do just that. That is what we should do as Members of the House of Representatives. Our constituents expect it from us to ensure that every vote is counted and that no one—no foreign source—can meddle in American elections, ever, as took place in 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and others who have worked very hard on this important legislation to pass the SHIELD Act this week. It is the right thing to do.

#### TELEMEDICINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of telemedicine.

Recently, I had the pleasure of participating in a roundtable discussion at Saint Francis University in Cambria County, Pennsylvania. Representatives from the university, Better Care America, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, and Highmark, among others, gathered to share their expertise on telemedicine and its impact on rural health.

Telemedicine is an incredibly important tool for millions of Americans, but particularly for those who live in rural communities. With telemedicine, we can increase access to care for those who live far away from a doctor's office or hospital.

Of course, this benefit extends beyond rural communities. Telemedicine

is crucial in ensuring older Americans and those with limited mobility are able to access quality medical care by eliminating roadblocks like finding transportation to a doctor's appointment. By increasing convenience and flexibility for patients, it encourages individuals to take a more proactive approach in managing their health.

Telemedicine can also have a positive impact on the health and well-being of our veterans. Their sacrifice and willingness to dedicate their lives to serve our country is a debt that we can never truly repay. The least we can do, however, is to ensure that they have access to quality healthcare. This includes mental health.

Many of our men and women in uniform are suffering privately with post-traumatic stress, depression, anxiety, brain injuries, and more. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that roughly 20 veterans commit suicide a day. We must do our part to prevent tragedies like this from happening.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2123, the Veterans E-Health and Telemedicine Support Act—or the VETS Act, as we call it—in 2017, alongside Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY. This bipartisan legislation reduces barriers for veterans seeking healthcare by removing burdensome location requirements, increasing access to care regardless of where the healthcare professional or the patient is located.

Prior to the VETS Act's enactment, VA doctors could only provide telehealth services across State lines if both the veteran and the doctor were located in Federal facilities. Undoing this restriction was successful under the VETS Act's adoption, and it is just one way that we can improve access to telehealth for millions of veterans nationwide.

Prior to the VETS Act, we were able to do that successfully a number of years ago with the STEP Act, the Servicemembers' Telemedicine and E-Health Portability Act, and it did the same thing for 1.1 million American heroes who are members of our Active-Duty military, Reserve, and Guard. The act lifted those same bureaucratic barriers to expand better access through telemedicine.

Through innovation and bipartisan support, we can continue to strengthen telemedicine care for all Americans.

#### PASSING USMCA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reconsider the unilateral push forward with impeachment. We have important and timely bipartisan issues to work on, such as passing USMCA.

Canada and Mexico represent 34 percent of all U.S. exports—by far, our most important trading partners.

The North American Free Trade Agreement that we know as NAFTA

was written more than 25 years ago, and the world has changed dramatically since its enactment. President Trump has made the modernization of trade between our three countries a top priority and has allowed us the chance to make some much-needed updates. USMCA upgrades and modernizes NAFTA. It will boost our economy, and it is a win for farmers, producers, and, definitely, consumers.

We have an opportunity to take action on trade, but the work must come first. It is our constitutional duty to start this process in the House. Delaying the enactment of USMCA hurts American jobs, border security, and agriculture, as well as innovation. We cannot afford to let this opportunity pass.

Mr. Speaker, let's begin the work in the Ways and Means Committee, and let's get this done. It is time to pass USMCA.

#### REMEMBERING ASSISTANT CHIEF CHRISTIAN JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and service of Assistant Fire Chief Christian Johnson of Okanogan County Fire District 3. Chief Johnson recently passed away due to injuries he sustained while fighting the Spring Coulee fire in north central Washington last September.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Johnson is an American hero. He served our country honorably, retiring from the Army after 22 years before joining the fire department nearly 20 years ago to serve his local community. His wife, Pam, described him as selfless, kind, and always ready to help someone in need. He was well-known and well-loved in Okanogan County, which is clear from the community's outpouring of support in recent weeks.

I encourage all in north central Washington to pay their respects at Chief Johnson's memorial this Thursday, October 24, at 1 p.m. at the Okanogan County Fairgrounds.

My deepest condolences go out to Pam and the Johnson family. The people of central Washington are eternally grateful for his selfless service to protect our communities.

Chief Johnson, may you rest in peace.

#### A RENEWED VISION FOR JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud and thank the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service for their recent announcement renewing their commitment and vision to the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center program.

Operated by the USDA and the Forest Service, Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, or CCCs, serve rural communities across the country by training the next generation of America's workforce to carry out a unique

and particularly important mission: conserving our Federal lands, mitigating fire threats, and suppressing active wildfires.

My central Washington district is home to two of these centers: Columbia Basin in Moses Lake and Fort Simcoe in White Swan. At these centers, students learn hands-on skills that they utilize to expand public access to Federal lands, improve campsites in national forests throughout Washington State, and serve as impactful stewards of our environment.

I have strongly supported and defended Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers because I have witnessed firsthand how these programs act as catalysts for the young people I represent, giving them a chance to give back to their community while learning life-changing skills.

I was sincerely grateful to Secretary Perdue for committing to work with me and my colleagues in Congress to help improve CCC programs across the country instead of transferring operations to the Department of Labor earlier this year. Now, with this recent announcement, Secretary Perdue has followed through on his word.

Under the Secretary's direction, Forest Service Chief Vicki Christiansen announced a recommitment to Job Corps CCC students by realigning the mission of these centers with the Forest Service's own motto, which is "Caring for the Land and Serving People."

The U.S. Forest Service is uniquely qualified to administer Civilian Conservation Centers, which play a critical role throughout the United States and go above and beyond traditional Job Corps programs. Under this new vision, these specialized Job Corps programs will better prepare both urban and rural youth to become the next generation of responsible land managers.

The Forest Service has committed to revamp the CCC's curriculum to meet the needs of Forest Service regions across the United States. Focusing on regional performance targets will allow the agency to increase student learning opportunities while making much-needed improvements to forest conditions. By strengthening the alumni network and supporting a pipeline between CCCs and the Forest Service, these centers can focus on jobs in forestry, firefighting, and conservation, which are all critical careers throughout the rural West.

In the words of Chief Christiansen: "Our Job Corps faculty and students embody the Forest Service values of service, interdependence, conservation, diversity, and safety."

As I have seen firsthand, these students and our public lands deserve this investment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank Secretary Sonny Perdue and Chief Vicki Christiansen for their commitment to rural America, our national lands, and the students of the Civilian Conservation Centers.

#### RECOGNIZING POLICE OFFICERS FROM MIDDLETOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR THEIR SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize four police officers from Middletown Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Officers Ryan Morrison, Christopher Viscardi, Glenn McPherson, and Robert Compton were recognized for their service during three separate cases this year.

On April 5, Officers McPherson and Viscardi were in Doylestown, Pennsylvania, to attend a court hearing. As they sat in their vehicle, they noticed a man threatening to jump from the top of the Bucks County Justice Center parking garage. Both officers quickly jumped into action, and Officer McPherson calmed the man down while Officer Viscardi contacted local law enforcement for assistance.

On June 16, Officer Compton was able to track down and detain the suspect following two gas station robberies by the same suspect.

On July 2, Officer Morrison noticed a car tailgating him and flashing high beams, which initiated a traffic stop. During that stop, Officer Morrison found the driver was intoxicated and the passenger had several warrants and was in possession of a firearm and narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, because of the actions of these brave officers and their colleagues, Pennsylvania's First District is a safer place. We thank these heroes for their service.

□ 1030

#### IN RECOGNITION OF MASON CHANDLER ALLEN

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mason Chandler Allen. A fellow native of Levittown, Pennsylvania, Mason was an intelligent and thoughtful 11-year-old boy when he was diagnosed with osteosarcoma, the most common form of bone cancer, in late 2015.

Through months of exhaustive chemotherapy, physical therapy, and several surgeries, Mason was never without a smile or his amazing sense of humor. He even got to hang out with his football idol, Philadelphia Eagles' star Darren Sproles, at an Eagles practice, and later, on the sideline of an Eagles game.

A year after homeschooling, Mason came back to school with the aid of crutches, and was excited to join clubs, launch the school's newspaper, and was soon able to leave the crutches behind. Following a holiday season surrounded by his family, the cancer returned in January of 2017. And on March 11, Mason lost his battle with cancer.

Soon after, Mason's family and friends founded the Mason Chandler Allen Memorial Foundation to increase awareness and funding to fight pediatric cancer. On September 28, the foundation held its third annual Steps

Towards the Cure Walk in my hometown of Levittown. This walk benefits pediatric cancer research funding and supports quality of life projects for children and teens who are fighting cancer.

Mr. Speaker, as long as organizations like this exist, we can continue the fight to end childhood cancer forever.

#### IN HONOR OF FRANK TROUTMAN, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Frank Troutman, Jr., who passed away on August 10 at the age of 84.

A great citizen of the State of Georgia, Mr. Troutman was passionate with every endeavor he undertook.

In academics, he graduated from the University of Georgia, earning Phi Beta Kappa membership, attended the university's law school, and remained a lifelong voracious reader and lover of history. He was one of the biggest Georgia Bulldog fans in the State, making the trip to Pasadena in 1943 to see the Dawgs play UCLA in the Rose Bowl.

Mr. Troutman served for 15 years as president of his family's Castleberry's food business, introducing modern techniques to the company, and making it into the business that it is today. And he was the first Republican elected to the Richmond County Commission, being largely responsible for introducing the Republican Party in the State of Georgia.

It would be hard to find anyone in Georgia more passionate about our State than Mr. Troutman, and I am thankful to have called him a fellow Georgian. His family and friends will be in our thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

#### IN REMEMBRANCE OF JUDGE TOM EDENFIELD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Judge Tom Edenfield, who passed away on Tuesday, October 15, at the age of 80.

Born and raised in Savannah, Georgia, Judge Edenfield made our community a better place to live during his numerous posts in the judicial system.

Only a few examples of his positions include his work as a special assistant to the district attorney, creating his own law firm, and presiding as a municipal court judge. Constantly using his position to help others as a municipal court judge, he would often suspend sentences in return for individuals attending a house of worship. He additionally assisted with the county's drug court in order to help people reclaim their lives from substance abuse problems and avoid incarceration.

Judge Edenfield's colleagues remember him as always having a smile on his face and a bad joke, along with being a mentor to all members of the bar. He will be missed throughout our

community, and I will keep his family and friends in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

#### IN REMEMBRANCE OF HARRIET KONTER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Ms. Harriet Konter, who passed away on Sunday, October 13 at the age of 94.

Ms. Konter was truly a pioneering woman in Georgia real estate. Working in the industry for over 50 years, she became the first female president of the Georgia Association of Realtors in 1987, as well as the first female member of the Georgia Realtors Hall of Fame.

She founded scholarships for female realtors to attend the National Women's Leadership Conference and remained heavily involved in real estate well into her nineties. Her colleagues remember her as someone who blazed a trail for many women in real estate and beyond.

Yet, Ms. Konter's passion to better our community reached everyone. She served as the director of the Savannah Jewish Educational Alliance, trustee for the Armstrong Atlantic State University Foundation, owned two local supermarkets, and more.

Ms. Konter will be missed throughout Savannah. Her family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF PIERCE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pierce County High School for being recognized by the Department of Education as a Blue Ribbon School for 2019.

This prestigious award recognized approximately 350 schools across the country for their commitment to academic excellence and closing the achievement gaps among diverse groups of students.

To commemorate the award, Pierce County High School will receive a flag that is a symbol of excellence in teaching and learning. The school has been providing a high-quality education to its students for a number of years, and this is not the first time the school has been recognized.

In 2018, Pierce County's principal, Ms. Dara Bennett, was named the Principal of the Year in the State of Georgia. Additionally, the National Federation of State High School Associations named their athletic department the third best in the Nation.

To teachers, students, and staff alike at Pierce County High School, congratulations on your awards and keep up the good work.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Help us this day to draw closer to You, so that with Your spirit, and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

May these decisive days through which we are living make them genuine enough to maintain their integrity, great enough to be humble, and good enough to keep their faith, always regarding public office as a sacred trust. Give them the wisdom and the courage to fail not their fellow citizens, nor You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. TRAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### REMEMBERING ELIJAH CUMMINGS

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember our dear colleague, Congressman Elijah Cummings.

Throughout his life, he was a passionate and committed leader but also

someone who would stop to show compassion and kindness to constituents, staff, and Members alike.

His life was defined, in his words, by "pain, passion, and purpose." At just 11 years old, he and his friends began working to integrate a segregated swimming pool in South Baltimore.

He would go on to achieve many of the highest accolades in education, earning 12 honorary doctorate degrees.

Before serving in the Halls of Congress, he served the people of Maryland for 14 years in the general assembly, including breaking the color barrier with his election to speaker pro tempore, the second highest ranking office in the Maryland House of Delegates.

He would come to Congress in 1996. All of his contributions and service to this Nation could never be summed up in a few seconds, but it stands on its own. When the history books are written, I know his name and legacy will be proudly enshrined within its pages.

His passing is a great loss to his family and friends, the city of Baltimore, this institution, and our Nation.

I hope you are dancing with the angels. May you rest in peace, my friend.

#### CELEBRATING PARAMEDIC ROGER SWOR

(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Roger Swor, a paramedic from my district who has dedicated his life to providing exceptional emergency medical care.

Roger is now the longest-serving street paramedic in Minnesota and was recently honored by the National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians for achieving 40 years of National EMS Certification. This is a distinction held by very few EMS professionals.

Roger has answered tens of thousands of 911 calls in his career. He has done everything from holding dying crash victims in his arms to delivering babies. As described by his nephew, Adam, who served many shifts alongside his uncle, "Roger is universally regarded as the paramedic you want to see when you are in trouble."

On behalf of Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, I congratulate Roger on his recent achievement and thank him for his professional service.

Paramedic Roger Swor, you are the best of the best.

#### IMPLEMENT ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS TO KEEP OUR ROADS SAFE

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SAFE DRIVERS Act introduced by my colleague, Representative SETH MOULTON.

In June of this year, seven members of Jarheads Motorcycle Club were tragically killed in my district when they were hit by a truck that crossed over into the wrong lane on Route 2 in Randolph, New Hampshire.

The Massachusetts driver responsible for this accident should not have had an active driver's license and should not have been behind the wheel that day. Despite his criminal history, the driver still had a license because of a loophole where State DMVs often do not process out-of-State infractions.

The SAFE DRIVERS Act would help States implement electronic systems to ensure that dangerous drivers are kept off our roads. By incentivizing States to modernize their databases, we can keep our roads safe and prevent further tragedies.

#### CONGRATULATING STAFF SERGEANT DAKOTA BOWEN, NCO OF 2019

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, congratulations to Staff Sergeant Dakota Bowen, who serves with Charlie Company, 3rd Battalion, 39th Infantry Regiment, at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. He is the Army's 2019 Noncommissioned Officer of the Year.

The NCO of the Year is the Army's top soldier, with competition annually on a variety of tasks testing their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Staff Sergeant Bowen emerged as the top NCO of the competition to win soldier of the year as this year's top NCO.

General Joseph Martin, the Army Vice Chief of Staff, calls NCOs the heart and soul of the Army. "When the Army desperately needs leadership, we turn to you, and you have never failed us," he said in a keynote speech at the awards ceremony.

As a 30-year Army veteran myself with three sons who have served in the Army, I know firsthand that this analysis is correct.

South Carolina is grateful for Staff Sergeant Dakota Bowen and his commitment to American families, promoting the truth that freedom is not free.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th, or the anniversary today of the Beirut bombing, murdering 241 servicemembers, in the global war on terrorism.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK "TOWKAR" APPICE

(Mr. ROSE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Frank "TowKar" Appice, a veteran of the U.S. Navy, avid motorcyclist, and active member of our community.

He passed away in 2017, but he is not forgotten. I am so proud that we recently named a street after him on Staten Island.

Frank was the founder and chairman of the board of Rolling Thunder, Chapter 2 New York, as well as an integral part of creating two chapters in Brooklyn.

Frank always wanted to use motorcycling to give back to our community, particularly our veterans. Every year, he oversaw the Disabled American Veterans support run for Chapter 2 New York, raising over \$75,000 for disabled veterans.

It is a fitting honor that his wife and children have formed a scholarship fund in his honor. This fund will continue Frank's passion for supporting veterans, ensuring that children of veterans or students who volunteer with veterans organizations can afford an education.

This scholarship ensures that we will always remember and learn from Frank and his legacy of service.

Frank, we will continue to honor you and your work.

God Bless Frank, and God bless the United States of America.

#### CONDEMNING UNFAIR IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly condemn the unfair, closed-door, hyperpartisan, impeachment inquiry process being conducted by House Democrats.

Nothing, not even the cold, hard facts, will stop the partisan politics of my colleagues on the left from nullifying the 2016 election.

One of Speaker PELOSI's committee chairs who she chose to lead this process promised years ago that she would find a way to impeach the President. This has been the plan from the beginning.

Certain minority rights have been denied to Republicans during this process, like equal subpoena power, a right that Republicans provided Democrats during the Clinton impeachment.

Chairman SCHIFF started this trend of dishonesty by promoting false allegations related to the President and Russia. Now, he has publicly mischaracterized his committee's handling of the whistleblower inquiry and deceived the American people about his relationship with the whistleblower.

Democrats still refuse to hold a full House vote on their impeachment inquiry, yet they continue this baseless impeachment inquiry of President Trump instead of tackling the issues most important to our citizens.

I urge the American people to take a hard look at the lack of transparency and accountability surrounding this unfounded impeachment inquiry.

#### HONORING GEORGE RAMIREZ FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS

(Mr. VELA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. George Ramirez for his extraordinary contribution to the culture and arts in Brownsville, Texas.

Mr. Ramirez was the longtime president of the Brownsville Society for the Performing Arts and founder of the Brownsville Latin Jazz Festival. He has been invaluable in bringing quality cultural entertainment to my community. Under Mr. Ramirez' leadership, the Brownsville Society for the Performing Arts has produced hundreds of shows, concerts, and cultural programs.

He dedicated his life to making the arts accessible to the people of the Rio Grande Valley.

In June 2017, Mr. Ramirez established his own low-powered radio station, which enabled him to bring music to everyone.

Mr. Ramirez helped create a number of cultural events, including the Brownsville Guitar Ensemble Festival and Competition, the Brownsville International Flamenco Festival, and the Ancient Cultures Festival.

He also spearheaded the efforts to bring Handel's "Messiah" concerts to Brownsville, Mozart's "Requiem in D Minor," Bach's "Mass in B Minor," and the annual children's "Hansel and Gretel" opera production.

A group of students in the University of Texas opera program had never seen an opera, so he coordinated and funded a trip to take them to the Houston Grand Opera. He was very active in helping students gain exposure to the arts, offering several music scholarships.

Mr. Ramirez' latest accomplishment was playing a vital role in the opening of the Brownsville Performing Arts Academy, a place that will carry on the tradition of Mr. Ramirez' work.

#### STOP POLITICAL GAMES AND GET BACK TO WORK

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, the impeachment of a President is a serious process that will have lasting effects on our Republic. It requires a transparent and trustworthy Congress to conduct a proper investigation because of the attempts to undo the will of the American people.

As a former prosecutor, I know that holding hearings behind closed doors is not transparent. Withholding information from the American people does not promote trust. Misconstruing the facts to the American public is not proper.

These actions alone point to an illegitimate process that will continue to

divide our Nation for the sake of partisan politics.

I ask, is the political gamesmanship worth letting our infrastructure continue to crumble? Is it worth ignoring the opioid crisis in our country? Is it worth undermining our democracy to attack a duly elected President?

We have real problems in this country that the American people elected us to solve, and we cannot ignore these problems while we focus on this improper and partisan political process.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to stop the political games so that we can get back to work on the issues that are important to the American people.

□ 1215

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019.

It is high time that our struggling seniors are given the right to negotiate drug costs just like we have in commercial plans, the Veterans Administration, the Department of Defense, and Medicaid.

Seniors should not be subject to artificially high copays and out-of-pocket expenses because of an out-of-date law that prohibits Medicare from negotiating prices with pharmaceutical companies. Price negotiation is a free market principle that our country embraces in almost every other aspect of life. Why should our seniors not have the same right?

H.R. 3 also limits Medicare part D out-of-pocket expenses to \$2,000 a year. This aligns closely with how the private market works and a Senate companion bill.

Making sure seniors can afford their medicines keeps them out of the expensive hospital system and saves patients and taxpayers, alike, lots of money.

Finally, there is an effort in the bill to limit the inflationary impact on drug costs that have been on the market for a long time and improve price transparency so we can actually shed some light on what is going on.

This is long overdue. It is time for bipartisan and bicameral action on one of the most pressing issues of our day for seniors and all Americans.

#### FIND AGREEMENT ON USMCA

(Mrs. AXNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to continue to work with U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer to find agreement on the USMCA soon.

I visit each of the 16 counties in my district every month, and whether it is touring manufacturers, visiting with

farmers, or stopping into small businesses, everywhere I go the message is loud and clear: Uncertainty is hurting our bottom line.

Agriculture is the backbone of Iowa's economy. One out of every \$5 is produced from Iowa agriculture in our State. Supporting farmers is neither a partisan nor a political issue; it is simply the right thing to do.

Between devastating weather events, ongoing trade wars, and the EPA's unprecedented abuse of biofuel waivers, our farmers have been put through enough. They are asking for our help. As elected Representatives, we owe them the right answer. We must answer their call and get this deal done right and without unnecessary delay.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the work they have done, and I urge them to expedite negotiations and finalize this agreement soon to make sure that we can make lives whole for the people suffering in the State of Iowa and across this country.

#### MINOR LEAGUE BASEBALL

(Mrs. TRAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of millions of Americans to call "foul" on Major League Baseball.

This week, Major League Baseball is discussing a proposal to cut the number of minor league franchises by 25 percent. The Lowell Spinners, a Red Sox affiliate, is among the 42 teams being forced out.

This plan is a betrayal of the fans and players as well as stadium vendors and employees around the Nation. It is an affront to the people of Lowell who swung for the fences in building LeLacheur Park, one of the Nation's best minor league parks.

As the World Series gets underway, remember that the minor league system produces the talent we see on the baseball diamond. MLB's plan is way off base and will hurt so many communities across the country that rely on minor league teams' presence.

Let's call it a balk and get back to rooting for the home team.

#### THE NEW NORMAL: BLACKOUTS

(Mr. HARDER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in frustration for my constituents in California's Central Valley. Folks across my community are reeling from blackouts caused by greed, corruption, and mismanagement at our State's largest utility, PG&E.

I am not the only one who is fed up. More than 1,000 people in my district had their power cut by PG&E, some for days.

Now the company is saying more blackouts could be coming this week and that it could be the new normal for

the next decade. I refuse to accept that.

Regular people can't choose to not pay their bills, and PG&E shouldn't be able to abuse that fact by refusing to invest in their grid. These blackouts are happening because rich executives decided to give themselves millions of dollars in bonuses instead of investing in their crumbling infrastructure.

Hundreds of thousands of people lost power because of these executives' greed. PG&E even proposed handing out another \$16 million in additional bonuses this year. It took a judge to stop their plan. Meanwhile, their shut-offs are estimated to cost our families more than \$2 billion.

#### MEDICARE LOW-INCOME LEGISLATION

(Mr. DELGADO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of seniors in upstate New York.

This August, I joined a forum with AARP in New Paltz on the need to address the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs in our communities. I heard harrowing stories from seniors, many of whom are on fixed income, who have seen the medication they rely on triple in price.

The system is working against our seniors. Right now, qualified covered retirement accounts are included in determining income and eligibility under the Medicare part D low-income subsidy program, and this means seniors must choose between saving for retirement and lifesaving medication.

Saving for retirement shouldn't jeopardize how low-income subsidies for Medicare part D beneficiaries are distributed. That is why I joined my colleagues in introducing H.R. 4655, the Enhancing Retirement Security for Medicare Beneficiaries Act of 2019, to remove retirement accounts from that determination and lower out-of-pocket costs for our seniors.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4655.

#### ELECTION REFORM

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, this Saturday, October 26, early voting begins in New York State for the first time, expanding the window for voters to select their government representatives.

This country has long upheld its protection of free and fair elections, keeping the power and decisionmaking where it should be: with, and only with, the American people.

Foreign interference in our elections is real, and its existence is threatening the legitimacy of our elections, national security, and the democracy this Nation was founded on.



Today the House will vote on the SHIELD Act, adding further transparency in campaigns, stiffer penalties for voter deception, and further restrictions against foreign interference, including making campaigns mandatory reporters if there is any offer of foreign assistance in those campaigns.

Madam Speaker, I urge others to join me in voting to protect the vote of the American people.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today because seniors in my district are walking out of the pharmacy without their medications after they look at the out-of-pocket price and say to themselves, "I can't afford this." They are not taking the medications they need, which jeopardizes their lives, and this is unacceptable.

It is their health—their very lives—that are on the line. That is why, when we are talking about prescription drugs, we must focus on lowering the out-of-pocket costs for seniors.

That is why I support H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act, because it requires Medicare to negotiate drug prices so that my constituents can get a fair and affordable price for their medication. It also caps the annual out-of-pocket costs for those seniors who require many medications or expensive medication.

No one should have to choose between buying groceries to eat or getting medications they need, and H.R. 3 will lower costs so seniors don't have to make that decision.

#### BRIDGETON VFW

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, today I want to show my appreciation for the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post of Bridgeton in south Jersey. This community provides a space for veterans to come together and connect with others, and these are other folks who understand the hardships and the rewards of serving our Nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars meet monthly to share their experiences and bond with one another in Bridgeton. They also organize special services for holidays, like Memorial Day and Veterans Day, so the members can commemorate these days together.

In addition, the VFW reaches out to the greater Bridgeton community by hosting barbecues, community dinners, and other festivals to connect with their neighbors and sometimes raise funds for important charitable causes.

I would like to thank the brave veterans of the Bridgeton VFW. Their service to our Nation is tremendous. I

am overjoyed that this community has given them a safe place to remember their service together.

Madam Speaker, they are our best; they are our shining stars; and they are our heroes.

May God bless them.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 23, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 23, 2019, at 9:21 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1590.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4617, STOPPING HARMFUL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOCRACY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 650 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 650

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4617) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-35 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed

in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 650, providing for consideration of H.R. 4617, the Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy, better known as the SHIELD Act, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration. The rule also executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman LOFGREN, makes in order 14 amendments, and provides one motion to recommit on the bill.

Madam Speaker, it is going to be interesting to watch my Republican friends twist pretzel-like today to convince themselves that voting against a bill that will protect the sanctity of our electoral process from foreign interference is the right thing to do for the American people.

Through today's rule, the Democrats bring to the floor a bill that states that those campaigns that are offered assistance from foreign actors should be required to report such attempts at assistance.

Sadly, I predict that my Republican friends will vote against such protections.



We, as Democrats, say that foreign governments should not be allowed to buy political advertisements in a clear and ongoing attempt to spread conspiracy theories and sow discord among the American electorate.

I predict that for reasons undecipherable, the Republicans will still vote against today's bill.

In fact, let us pause here for a moment. The use of social media platforms by maligned actors to undermine our democracy is not only historical, but is happening today, as we speak. An article that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post outlines how Russia's intelligence apparatus through the Internet Research Agency continues to use Facebook and Facebook's photo-sharing app, Instagram, to sow discord among the American people.

With alarming precision, they target our vulnerabilities, our fears, our baser instincts in hopes of tearing asunder the fabric of our democracy.

As it turns out, past is indeed prologue, and unless we want Facebook and others to be left to play an ongoing game of whack-a-mole against Russian, and now apparently Iranian, and potentially other intelligence agencies, we in Congress need to provide the needed support that any platform can fully meet the threat posed by these nefarious actors.

Madam Speaker, on this side of the aisle, we say that we should strengthen the ban against foreign nationals and foreign governments spending money in our elections, and we have put pen to paper in today's bill to ensure that we do, indeed, strengthen such a ban.

Again, I predict that many, if not all, of my colleagues across the aisle will vote against today's bill, and, therefore, against the notion that foreign governments ought not to be spending money in our elections.

Today's bill is a direct rebuke of the Trump campaign's sharing of nonpublic polling information with Russian intelligence in the hopes that this information would make it to Moscow in order to help with their beyond well-documented campaign to interfere with the 2016 Presidential election.

Simply put, this bill treats the behavior engaged in by the Trump campaign as an illegal solicitation of support. Why? Because that is what it was.

Again, I say to the American people, watch today's vote. I once again predict that you will see Republicans vote against making such behavior illegal, and that is sad.

Finally—and this one is personal—today's bill incorporates language that will punish those who seek to intimidate, misinform, or maliciously misdirect those who simply wish to exercise that great American pastime: casting a ballot.

Attempts to dissuade voters from going to the polls, whether through violence or other means, have been part of this country's history for far too long.

We now know that in addition to homegrown efforts to keep voters away

from the polls on election day, the Russians also engaged in voter suppression tactics, including the malicious dissemination of misinformation in a brazen attempt to sow confusion in the electorate in 2016. I might add, that three Florida counties had their elections offices compromised by Russian hackers.

A vote for today's rule is a vote to bring forth a bill that will work to put an end to these dastardly deeds. Unfortunately, for reasons unfathomable, Republicans will stand brick-wall-like against such reform.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise to exercise the time that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend, has extended to me.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, my very good friend, the distinguished vice-chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would be the first to admit that there are some good things in this bill. But to say also to my good friend, at the end of the day it is a very easy no. And that is sad.

Frankly, we could have had an opportunity to work together in a bipartisan fashion and actually produce a product that would be effective and one in which every Member of this Chamber could vote for. But my friends have chosen not to do that.

Madam Speaker, we are here on another attempt by the majority to push deeply partisan measures to change America's electoral system in response to the 2016 Presidential election.

Earlier this year, the majority pushed through H.R. 1, which they gave the misnomer of the, "For the People Act." The reality was that H.R. 1 was completely misnamed. It was not "for the people," it was for the Democratic majority, by the Democratic majority in hopes of maintaining the Democratic majority for many years to come.

Similarly today, we are considering H.R. 4617, yet another misnamed and misguided bill aimed at changing America's election laws. The majority has called H.R. 4617 the SHIELD Act. Unfortunately, this bill shields us from exactly nothing. It expands the power of the Federal Government, limits freedom of speech, and reduces the ability of the American people to participate in their own elections, all while failing to protect our democracy from foreign interference.

Before I talk about the problems with the SHIELD Act, I think we should be clear: Republicans stand ready and willing to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to reform our election system and protect it from foreign influence.

My good friend from Illinois, Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS, has proposed such a bill that would do exactly

that. H.R. 4736, the Honest Elections Act updates existing election laws in a fair way. It strengthens the Foreign Agents Registration Act to combat election interference, modernizes online political ad disclosure, increases monitoring of spending by foreign nationals in our elections, and bans the practice of ballot harvesting.

These are the kinds of bipartisan solutions Republicans and Democrats should be able to come together on. But instead, the majority is once again proposing a partisan bill that fails to put forward real solutions to these problems.

Let's take a look at just a few of those provisions in H.R. 4617:

First, H.R. 4617 imposes draconian limitations on online political advertising that will only make it harder for Americans to participate in our elections. It applies a model of regulation designed for TV ads to online ads, which are two very different media. And it requires the same four-second disclosures for online ads as they currently require for TV ads, even though online ads are generally significantly shorter.

H.R. 4617 also attempts to add limitations on the ability of foreign nationals to buy online ads for electioneering communications. But I note this will likely have very little effect. The primary means by which Russia interfered in the 2016 election was through traditional social media posts and troll farms, which this bill will not impact.

What is worse, the bill also expands the definition of the term "electioneering communication" to include, "issues of national importance." This term is going to become so overinclusive that it will become meaningless. If a company wants to take out an advertisement talking about the need for jobs in their community, they may be shocked to learn that they have actually purchased an electioneering communication and are now subject to new rules of political advertisement.

This kind of overinclusive, ill-defined regulation will do nothing to protect our democracy, and will, instead, just simply make it harder for Americans to exercise their right to freedom of speech.

What is worse, the bill expands the power of the United States Attorney General—hardly a nonpartisan figure—by allowing that political official to interfere in State elections, by any means necessary. This unprecedented intervention ability would mean that the Congress is once again expanding the power of Washington at the expense of the States.

Madam Speaker, a bill this flawed should never have come before the Rules Committee and should not be coming to the floor. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to prevent foreign interference and secure our elections, but instead, the majority is putting forward a deeply partisan product that will not secure our elections and will only make it harder for

Americans to participate in their own democracy.

And, frankly, they are putting forward a product that I think they have every confidence the Senate will not take up, and the President, I would predict, would almost certainly not sign.

We can and should do better than that. I look forward to when my friends decide they want to do better than that to actually working with them.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), distinguished ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, and my good friend.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to this great institution to talk about this piece of legislation. I thank the ranking member and also my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for a great spirited debate last night in the Rules Committee, but I still, today, have to rise in opposition to the rule for consideration of H.R. 4617.

Last night at the Rules Committee meeting, there was bipartisan consensus that this bill has not gone through regular order. We did not have the opportunity to hold a single hearing addressing foreign political propaganda in the Committee on House Administration.

We are focusing on paid political advertisements, when the Senate Intel's bipartisan report stated that "paid advertisements were not key" to Russia's activity. Out of the \$1.4 billion spent on political advertisements in the 2016 election cycle on digital advertising, the Russians spent \$100,000 of that over 2 years on paid political Facebook ads.

This is relevant information. This should have been considered and discussed in a committee hearing before sidestepping process and rushing a bill to the floor that does not address key issues.

None of us had a chance to ask Facebook: "Why did you take a payment from Russia?"

"Was it in rubles?"

"Was it in dollars?"

"Why in the world did you take \$100,000 from Russia and put overtly political ads online?"

At some point, companies that participate in the political process, we need to have them in front of us to ask them why; ask them how. But we didn't get a chance to do that because the Committee on House Administration had zero hearings before rushing this bill to the floor.

We have a process here in the House for a reason, Madam Speaker. The process is set up to make sure what gets to the floor will address the problem at hand and will not harm the

rights of the American people. Instead, the language in this bill is so broad that it does little to stop foreign political propaganda and, instead, creates a chilling effect on America's free speech.

If the House had held hearings on this legislation, then we could have appropriately tailored language to address the real problem of foreign interference without affecting free speech.

In 2016, the Russians tampered in our elections and engaged in stunning misinformation campaigns in an effort to undermine our elections.

□ 1245

Much of what the Russians did was already illegal. If we want to stop this from happening in the future, then we should be strengthening existing laws and making sure law enforcement has the resources it needs to track down foreign nationals that are breaking the law by spreading propaganda.

Instead, this bill provides zero resources to help law enforcement enforce existing laws and, rather, imposes new regulations that will harm Americans' right to free speech.

The sweeping language in this bill will very likely silence the voices of honest American organizations and nonpolitical companies that wish to speak out on "issues of national importance."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. SHIELD's burdensome regulations will make it more difficult for Americans to be heard. Isn't that the goal of the Russians, to shut down our free and open society and silence the voices of Americans?

Madam Speaker, we should support our law enforcement to do their jobs, not make up new regulations that chill free speech.

This bill is a misinformation stunt to the American people. It sends a message to America that something is being done to stop what happened in 2016 when, in reality, it fails to address the actual threat. It is a Trojan horse from the majority.

Do we actually want to stop foreign interference, or do my colleagues simply want talking points?

Madam Speaker, you have a bill before you that will not stop meddling. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I would ask my friend Mr. DAVIS if he would stand by just a minute. I have a query of him.

Last night in the Rules Committee, our colleague ED PERLMUTTER offered the gentleman an opportunity to come today to ask Mr. Zuckerberg the questions that he put here. Is the gentleman availing himself of that opportunity?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for reminding everybody here that I was offered a chance by my good friend ED PERLMUTTER, a Democrat from Colorado, to actually ask Facebook, ask Mark Zuckerberg, a question of why they took that payment.

The answer, Mr. HASTINGS, is yes. I went over to the Financial Services Committee. I specifically spoke with Mr. PERLMUTTER in the committee hearing room, where he told me that Chairwoman WATERS would allow Members who were not on the committee, like me, to ask questions, but I probably have to come back in about 5 hours.

I am hoping to do that. I am hoping to go back there later this afternoon and ask that question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, in light of the process questions that the gentleman asked about hearings, I am proud of our Democratic majority's record when it comes to regular order.

At the beginning of this Congress, we instituted a rule to require hearings and markups for bills that come through the Rules Committee, and we have followed that rule.

In fact, the House Administration Committee, the primary committee of jurisdiction for this bill, held three hearings to develop the SHIELD Act. Those three hearings took place on February 14, May 8, and May 21, and they are clearly listed in the House Administration Committee's report.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I include in the RECORD the House Administration Committee's report.

#### HEARINGS

For the purposes of section 103(i) of H. Res. 6 of the 116th Congress the following hearings were used to develop or consider H.R. 2722:

(1) On Wednesday, May 8, 2019 the Committee held a hearing titled "Election Security." The following witnesses testified: Mr. Larry Norden, Brennan Center for Justice; Ms. Marian Schneider, Verified Voting; Mr. Joseph Lorenzo Hall, Center for Democracy and Technology; The Honorable Jocelyn Benson, Secretary of State, State of Michigan; and The Honorable John Merrill, Secretary of State, State of Alabama.

(2) On Tuesday, May 21, 2019, the Committee held a hearing titled "Oversight of the Election Assistance Commission." The following witnesses testified: The Honorable Christy McCormick, Commissioner and Chairwoman, Election Assistance Commission, accompanied by The Honorable Benjamin Hovland, Commissioner and Vice Chair, Election Assistance Commission; The Honorable Don Palmer, Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission; and The Honorable Thomas Hicks, Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission.

(3) On Thursday, February 14, 2019, the Committee held a hearing titled "For the People: Our American Democracy." The following witnesses testified: Mr. Chiraag Bains, Director of Legal Strategies, Demos; Ms. Wendy Weiser, Director, Democracy Program, Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law; Mr. Fred Wertheimer, President, Democracy 21; The Honorable Kim

Wyman, Secretary of State, State of Washington; Mr. Alejandro Rangel-Lopez, Senior at Dodge City High School, Dodge City Kansas, and plaintiff in LULAC & Rangel-Lopez v. Cox; Mr. Peter Earle, Wisconsin Civil Rights Trial Lawyer; Mr. Brandon A. Jessup, Data Science and Information Systems Professional; Executive Director, Michigan Forward; and David Keating, President, Institute for Free Speech.

#### COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On Wednesday, October 16, 2019, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill H.R. 4617 favorably reported with an amendment to the House, by a roll call vote of 6 to 1, a quorum being present. During consideration of the bill an amendment (Amendment No. 5) was offered by Mr. Davis of Illinois and was agreed to by voice vote:

An amendment (No. 5) offered by Mr. Davis of Illinois to amend section 201(b) of the amendment in the nature of a substitute to insert "labor organization" after "a corporation" and after "the corporation" each place that it appears.

Mr. HASTINGS. In addition to those three hearings, the House Administration Committee held eight other election-related hearings this year.

I also want to point out that while it isn't the primary committee of jurisdiction for this bill, the Judiciary Committee held two hearings on election security.

The House Administration Committee also held a markup on H.R. 4617. Several amendments were offered, including an amendment by the gentleman who just spoke, my friend, Ranking Member DAVIS, that was adopted by the committee.

This is how the process is supposed to work, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful that that will help clarify some aspects of what was brought up about process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I thank the House Administration Committee, both the chairman and ranking member. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for managing this rule.

I want to emphasize, particularly to the gentleman from Florida, for his recitation of the number of hearings that were held, but I want to emphasize that time is of the essence.

Right now, in many of our jurisdictions, there are local elections going on. In just a couple of weeks or more, many will begin to engage in either primaries or the signing up of candidates for the 2020 election. We have taken an oath to protect and serve and to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Everyone knows what happened in 2016. Everywhere you go, local officials and State officials are asking us, the Federal Government: What are you doing to protect the sanctity of the 2020 election?

There is no doubt that, in volume 1, there is clarity of the number of Russian operatives contacting and interacting with the Trump campaign in 2016. There is no conflict or disagree-

ment with the bias of those that participated, Russian operatives, in this campaign, Russian bots.

Time is of the essence. One of the most important elements of this bill that I applaud is the inclusion of my language in H.R. 2353, Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference in American Elections.

I don't think one American would disagree, not respecting any party affiliation, that if an operative from another country came to you to give you information, it is your responsibility to report it to the FBI under the Federal election laws, which was my bill, Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference.

We don't disagree in that. I hope we don't disagree that it is inappropriate to seek foreign assistance for a campaign, because one of the things of the Founding Fathers that I think is very clear in the Constitution and is very clear in the papers that surround it—the Federalist Papers and the comments of Benjamin Franklin when the audience was waiting, wondering whether we had a monarchy or a republic, and he said a republic, if we can keep it—that is that this Constitution and this process of elections was supposed to be unfettered, one vote, one person.

That is why we have had to perfect it with the Voting Rights Act that we are trying to reauthorize, certain aspects of it. That is why we have written laws to protect voters and election laws wherein we protect voters—one vote, one person.

So, I support the underlying bill, H.R. 4617, Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy.

Remember, Benjamin Franklin said it is a republic, if we can keep it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Rule for H.R. 4617, the "Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for A Lasting Democracy Act," or SHIELD Act and the underlying legislation.

I support this legislation introduced by my colleague, the Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentlelady from California, Chairwoman LOFGREN, because it:

1. Creates a duty to report illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments and their agents;
2. Helps prevent foreign interference in future elections by improving transparency of online political advertisements;
3. Closes loopholes that allow foreign nationals and foreign governments to spend in U.S. elections;
4. Restricts exchange of campaign information between candidates and foreign governments and their agents; and
5. Prohibits deceptive practices about voting procedures.

Madam Speaker, earlier this year FBI Director Christopher Wray testified before the Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is "a 365-day-a-year threat."

This is outrageous; American elections are to be decided by Americans.

That is why I am particularly pleased that H.R. 4617 incorporates the key provisions of

H.R. 2353, the "Duty To Refuse And Report Foreign Interference In Elections Act" that I introduced in April of this year.

Madam Speaker, our friends across the aisle voted against Republicans voted against H.R. 1, the "For The People Act of 2019," which, *inter alia*, would secure our elections, and then against H.R. 2722, the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or SAFE Act, which closes dangerous gaps in our voting security into the 21st Century.

Today our Republican colleagues have another chance to demonstrate that they take seriously their oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

Madam Speaker, on January 6, 2017, representatives of the Intelligence Community advised the President-Elect that the Russian Federation conducted a sophisticated campaign to subvert our democracy with the goal of electing Donald Trump and defeating Hillary Clinton.

The Report issued by Special Counsel Robert Mueller on March 22, 2019 revealed that the Russians effectuated their goals by selectively disseminating stolen emails, with the end of maximizing the adverse impact this would have on Secretary Clinton's electoral prospects.

The Mueller Report further indicated that Russia's misinformation efforts also included the proliferation of fake online profiles on social media platforms, with the goal of echoing and amplifying politically divisive messages, so as to sow discord within the electorate and suppress the vote for Secretary Clinton.

As the Mueller Report lays bare, the Trump Campaign knew what Russia was doing and welcomed that assistance, did nothing to discourage it, did not report it, denied its existence and knowingly and happily accepted the benefits of the hostile foreign interference.

While some may tolerate this as awful but lawful conduct, none of the bill's sponsors or supporters do because it is deeply corrosive of our democracy.

In April of this year I introduced H.R. 2353, the "Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference in American Elections Act of 2019," to impose an affirmative duty to refuse any offer of election campaign assistance from any agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government and to report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation any such offer of assistance from an agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government.

This duty to refuse and report applies to candidates and any person working for, or volunteering with, a candidate for election to federal office.

The legislation also requires the Federal Election Commission to require that a candidate for election to federal office must certify quarterly that he or she is compliance with the above requirements on penalty of not more than 5 years in prison and a fine of not more than \$250,000.

Madam Speaker, the threat to our country is real, as documented in detail in the report issued by Special Counsel Mueller, confirmed by the unanimous assessment of our nation's Intelligence Community, and affirmed most recently by FBI Director Wray who testified in Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is "a 365-day-a-year threat."

It is past time to write into the books of law the sensible and self-protective principle that

American elections are to be decided only by American citizens, and not influenced by foreign adversaries.

I encourage all members to join me in voting to keep Americans in control of our electoral process and elections by voting to pass H.R. 4716, the SHIELD Act.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just quickly, to respond to a couple of points my friends made, first, let's remember, in 2016, President Obama was the President of the United States when a lot of the activity that my friends are concerned about took place. In 2018, when President Trump was President, we don't have accusations of foreign interference. As a matter of fact, it was a pretty good election cycle for my friends, and I congratulate them on that.

So, I suspect this administration has done a better job than the last administration in dealing with these issues. But I agree there are some things we can and should work on to improve our system, and we have offered—Mr. DAVIS chief among them—a variety of areas where we can cooperate and where we, frankly, agree.

In the areas where we can't agree, let's set them aside and have our disagreements. But where we can, let's put things together that we all agree on and at least get those things passed. That would be my recommended choice.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately suspend the House's impeachment inquiry until the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 and the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2020 are law.

Madam Speaker, Congress has failed to meet the deadline for one of our most crucial responsibilities, to pass the authorization act and the appropriations bill for our national defense prior to the start of the fiscal year. We did not succeed in getting either of these bills into law by September 30, and now the Department of Defense is operating under a continuing resolution, which in no way adequately supports and funds our military.

Instead of pushing forward, the House is distracted by an unprecedented and unauthorized impeachment inquiry, which is remarkable mostly for the complete lack of transparency the majority has adopted. Republicans have been repeatedly denied their reasonable requests to attend depositions with witnesses and even to review transcripts and other documents. Moreover, the House is proceeding in this inquiry without ever taking a vote to authorize it or establish the parameters and ensure due process.

At a time when threats are continuing to emerge around the world, and our constituents want us to tackle important issues impacting their everyday lives, the House can ill afford the distraction this inquiry is causing.

Consequently, my amendment will require us to suspend the impeachment

inquiry until such time as both the NDAA and the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2020 have been enacted.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and join him in opposing the previous question so that Congress can meet its most fundamental responsibilities under the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8 says that it is Congress' responsibility to "raise and support," "provide and maintain" for the military forces of the United States.

Congress is failing in that responsibility. Not only have we missed the October 1 deadline, but we are currently operating under a stopgap funding measure that prevents our military from adapting to a volatile world, and even that expires in less than a month.

In this debate today, we have heard a lot about Russian attempts to interfere in our elections. Well, who is on the front lines of protecting the country in cyberspace as well as the other domains? It is the American military. It is the Cyber Command that is funded for less than a month.

It seems to me that we ought to start with the first responsibility of providing for our military, which is on the front lines of defending us, yes, in cyberspace as well as all the other domains of warfare.

While this House and Washington in general are consumed by secret impeachment proceedings, adversaries are looking to take advantage of this Washington dysfunction.

Who gets caught in the middle of all this political squabbling? It is our troops, the very men and women who volunteer to risk their lives to protect us. They are the ones who suffer the most.

There are dozens of programs in every military service that cannot begin under the current stopgap funding measure. There are dozens of programs in every service where we need to do more of something, but we can't do more under the current continuing resolution.

There are many programs we need to hire good people to work on. You can't do that under the current stopgap funding measure.

Instead, what we get is political squabbling.

Now, I know there will be people who say: Well, the House has passed these

bills. It is the Senate's fault. It is Trump's fault. It is somebody else's fault.

We have enough of that squabbling, finger-pointing, and blame. What we need are results. Results will require the leadership of this House to focus on getting first things done first, and that means we need to get these essential defense bills signed into law. To get them signed into law, they have to be done in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I am absolutely convinced that, given the chaos and volatility of this world, the United States is going to be tested severely in the weeks to come. The best thing this Congress can do is put aside the political squabbling and focus on support for those people who are defending us, the American military.

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, through you, I would advise my friend that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close if he is.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the distinguished ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

The House should focus on our constitutional responsibility to fund the government and provide for our national defense.

Current government funding runs out in 29 days. But instead of finalizing the National Defense Authorization Act or Defense appropriations bill, we are debating partisan messaging bills and distracted by an impeachment process that lacks any semblance of transparency.

Last year, Republicans made defense their highest priority. The Defense appropriations bill was law before the end of the fiscal year, and the NDAA was signed in August. This year, the NDAA has been in conference for more than a month, and the House last acted on Defense appropriations in June.

China and Russia aren't slowing down their defense buildup. Why should we handicap our own military and allow our enemies to take advantage of our distraction? This is dangerous and shortsighted.

Our highest priority must be keeping the government functioning and the Defense Department fully funded. This House must focus on providing for our national defense and work with our colleagues in the Senate and the White House.

In order to achieve this goal, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and a "no" vote on the underlying measure.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, very briefly, the last three speakers, including my good friend from Oklahoma, have mentioned the ongoing impeachment inquiry here in the House of Representatives, and they speak of it as being a lack of transparency. It is almost as if the Republicans are not in the hearings that are going on in this inquiry.

In my understanding, although I am not a member of either of the committees of jurisdiction, I have spoken with and have heard publicly the person who is the responsible person for ongoing matters at this time say that the other side is there. Their lawyers are asking questions. Members, if they choose, are asking questions.

So I don't understand what they are talking about about a lack of transparency, particularly when the previous impeachments that were done were done by special prosecutors. This is a solemn process.

And while I agree with my colleagues about the National Defense Authorization measure, the simple fact of the matter is that we also have a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the executive branch of this government functions in an appropriate manner and does not do as they are doing: failing to respond to the oversight responsibilities of the Article I House of Representatives.

I rather suspect that that is just talk when they say that there is no transparency. I suggest to them to stick around. They are going to see some transparency real soon.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to begin by thanking my very good friend from Florida for what we always get, which is always a thoughtful debate, always professional, always civil. And even when we disagree, I always enjoy the exchange, so I thank my friend for that.

I will disagree vehemently, though, that the process in terms of impeachment that we are going through right now is remotely transparent. The American people can't get in there. And, frankly, I can tell you, Members, under the rules of the Intelligence Committee, all of us, as long as it is not classified, are supposed to be able to get transcripts. We haven't been able to get those things. So we will watch as this unfolds.

But my friends would have been far better to do what has been done in previous impeachments; that is, to hold a formal vote, to set up a process.

I do remind my friend, when we went through this during the Clinton years, the President, President Clinton, had the right to have counsel there, the right to cross-examine witnesses, the right to subpoena witnesses. Our friends who were then in the minority had the right to subpoena witnesses.

None of that exists now. There is no process. It is very one-sided, very opaque, very obscure, and extremely partisan.

But back to the legislation at hand.

The tragedy here is that we could work together on a variety of things that we both agree would make good law. My good friend, the ranking—excuse me—the chairwoman on the House Administration Committee, Ms. LOfGREN, mentioned that last night.

There are actually elements in this bill which, I agree with my friend, are things we could work on together. There are other things that, whether we are right or wrong, my friend knows we will disagree with and we will not accept and, frankly, the United States Senate will not accept and the President will not accept.

So it is a classic legislative dilemma: What do you want to do? Do you want to make a point or do you want to make law?

If you want to make law, you get to the things that you agree on and that can pass the other Chamber and be signed by the President. So far in this area of election security, I think my friends have been more interested in making a point than actually in making law.

So I urge opposition to the rule on H.R. 4617 because it is deeply flawed and a partisan bill that will not solve the underlying problems. It will not prevent foreign interference in our elections. It will only make it harder for Americans to participate in their own democracy.

It applies inappropriate regulatory schemes to online advertisement. It applies overly inclusive definitions that could make almost any advertisement a political advertisement and expands the power of the Attorney General at the expense of the States.

My friends seemed, over and over, to want to federalize State elections. We don't want to do that. That is a big mistake. One of the best securities we have is that we have multiple jurisdictions, and the people close to the people make the laws under which our elections occur.

We can work together in a bipartisan manner and find real solutions to real problems, and I hope and I believe some day we will, Madam Speaker. But in the interim, I urge the House to reject both this rule and this bill so that we can actually advance, together, on something that can pass and become law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I do agree with my good friend from Oklahoma that our exchanges are civil; and although we have respectable disagreement, the simple fact of the matter is that each of us discharges our responsibilities in a responsible way.

Madam Speaker, after exiting the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Ben-

jamin Franklin, when approached, was asked what form of government had been agreed upon; his response: "A Republic, if you can keep it."

We come here today to keep it, to not only keep it, but make more perfect that Union which we have all taken an oath to protect, not just for us and our children, but for generations unborn, so that they may know and benefit from the greatest experiment ever known to humankind, the democratic Republic we call the United States of America.

To do this, to protect our democracy from enemies foreign and domestic, we must put country over party. Indeed, there have been more than a few times in our history when it was imperative that the partisan give way to the patriotic. This is undoubtedly one of those times and one of those paramount issues.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 650

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall suspend pursuing matters referred to by the Speaker in her announcement of September 24, 2019, until such time as the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2020 are signed into law.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 777) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 777

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “including” and inserting “prioritizing, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations”; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “including” and inserting “in particular,”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) provide assurances that the DNA section of the laboratory to be used to conduct DNA analyses has a written policy that prioritizes the analysis of, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations, samples from homicides and sexual assaults.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 303(b) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40722(b)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019.

The Debbie Smith Act, named for a courageous woman who has fought for

the rights of survivors of sexual assault, is critical to helping States process DNA evidence and reduce the Nation’s large backlog of untested DNA samples.

The law, which I helped author and enact in its original form in 2004, was developed in response to a crisis of untested DNA samples, a problem that we have helped to reduce but which, unfortunately, still requires our urgent attention today.

Over the past several decades, evidence from DNA samples has helped us solve an increasing number of criminal cases and has been particularly valuable in identifying the perpetrators of the horrible and all-too-common crime of sexual assault.

The use of DNA evidence kits in sexual assault cases is critical, and it is imperative that the evidence that is collected is analyzed as soon as possible. When the evidence is collected and processed, the DNA profile is added to the Combined DNA Index System so that matches against other DNA profiles can be sought, increasing the scope of the database.

By testing the DNA evidence left at the scene of a rape or sexual assault, we can increase the likelihood of identifying the perpetrators, making it more likely that they will be captured, punished, and prevented from doing it again. This, in turn, allows victims to obtain some measure of justice and society to take violent criminals off the streets. DNA evidence also allows us, definitively, to exonerate the falsely accused.

Over time, however, crime labs across the country, regrettably, developed a large backlog of DNA samples that they had not tested, an intolerable situation calling out for Federal action.

In response, in 2000, I cosponsored the passage of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act, which provided \$40 million to help States analyze DNA evidence; and in 2002, I introduced the Rape Kit DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act. This legislation authorized funding to help police departments finance the testing of rape kits to reduce the backlog. Working with my colleagues and with advocates, we maintained the pressure to address this problem.

Then, in 2004, I was the original cosponsor of the Justice for All Act, introduced by our colleague JIM SENSENBRENNER. That bill included many of the provisions of my 2002 bill.

Title II of that bill, named the Debbie Smith Act by Congresswoman MALONEY, authorized substantial funding for DNA testing and strengthened the ability of State and local law enforcement specifically to test rape kits. We subsequently reauthorized the Debbie Smith Act in 2008 and again in 2014.

In recent years, the grants we have reauthorized under the Debbie Smith Act have supported the work of crime labs to build capacity and process DNA

evidence, including evidence collected in rape kits, with greater percentages of funding allocated to testing these kits provided in subsequent amendments.

□ 1315

The act also supports audits of evidence awaiting analysis at law enforcement agencies and charges the Department of Justice with the task of maintaining national testing guidelines.

Despite these efforts, the rape kit backlog continues to be a major concern, with a large volume of kits still untested in this country, harming the survivors of sexual assault and jeopardizing public safety. Therefore, we must continue the valuable programs authorized by this important law.

That is why we included the reauthorization of this program in the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA reauthorization bill, developed by the Judiciary Committee and passed by the House earlier this year. Unfortunately, VAWA is languishing in the Senate.

While we take steps to separately pass the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith program today, I again call on the Senate to fulfill their responsibility to pass the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization without needless additional delay. Therefore, I support H.R. 777.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I was actually on the Arizona task force to look into Arizona’s backlog on these rape kits, and so it is something that I am very passionate about doing. I am pleased that after months of inaction and after the authorization for the program had already expired, my colleagues in the majority have finally brought a Debbie Smith reauthorization bill to the House floor.

Unfortunately, I think it is the wrong one.

Senator CORNYN’s bill, S. 820, passed the Senate in May by unanimous consent. It has been sitting here in the House waiting to be acted upon for more than 5 months. But my colleagues have been too busy chasing impeachment conspiracies to notice or care. I offered an amendment right here at this desk previously on the floor to move forward the Debbie Smith Act, but the Democrats voted it down at that time. The program expired at the end of September without so much as a glance from my fellow Democratic colleagues. Finally, House Republicans had to file a discharge petition to force consideration of this important legislation.

Let me repeat that, Madam Speaker. Democrats were too busy on their crusade against the duly-elected President to engage in their efforts to nullify the will and vote of the American people to take up and pass a bipartisan bill to help rape survivors and victims and law enforcement.



Even today, all we are doing is ensuring there will be more delay in the reauthorization of this vital program. That is because rather than pass the bipartisan bill the Senate passed 5 months ago, the majority is bringing an alternative bill to the floor.

In the ultimate act of hubris and partisanship, the majority is insisting that this body pass a bill with an H.R. number instead of the Senate bill that has sat idle here for 5 months.

What would happen if we passed the Senate bill? It would go immediately 16 blocks down Pennsylvania Avenue and be signed by the President today. Instead, unfortunately, the majority is engaging, I believe, in a game of political brinksmanship and holding their authorization of these precious grant dollars hostage, grant dollars that provide closure and solace to countless survivors of rape and the family members of victims of rape.

The majority's actions are putting an unnecessary delay in getting this program reauthorized. And for what reason? I can't think of a single good reason. Perhaps someone on the other side of the aisle can provide one. Is that what they want? They want the credit for the bill, a House bill instead of a Senate bill?

As Debbie Smith herself was recently quoted, "Don't punish the victims." Not acting on the Senate bill is doing just that.

Madam Speaker, I will support this bill today. I believe these programs and the survivors they serve are too critical to be the subject of partisan games. I am disappointed, however, that my colleagues do not feel the same way, otherwise they would put forward the Senate bill. I expect and hope we will be back on this floor in the very near future to pass a bill to actually authorize this vital program.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the reauthorization of this bill has been sitting in the VAWA reauthorization bill passed by this House many months ago, it has been sitting in the Senate since then.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman from the great State of New York for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on the Judiciary Committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act, as amended. I was pleased to introduce this bill with my colleague and good friend ANN WAGNER of Missouri.

I first passed this bill in 2004. This critical State backlog grant program provides funding for forensic labs and local law enforcement to process DNA evidence, including rape kits.

In 2001, I invited a woman named Debbie Smith to testify before the Oversight and Government Reform

Committee. Debbie was a rape survivor, and I remember being struck by her story of waiting more than 6 years for her rape kit to be processed. And Debbie's story is not unique.

Across this country, DNA evidence collected at crime scenes sits in a backlog, because forensic labs have limited capacity or resources to process it in a timely manner.

So I wrote and passed the Debbie Smith Act, which at the time was called the most important antirape legislation ever signed into law.

The results of the grant program speak for themselves. The National Institute of Justice reports that since 2005 Debbie Smith funding is responsible for 192,000, or about 42 percent, of DNA matches in the FBI database.

So when it can match and convict a rapist, it prevents future rapes. The FBI says rapists will attack roughly seven times, so if you catch that person and put them in jail, you protect other women from being hurt.

And as improved technology enables collection of DNA evidence, demand for grant funding has dramatically increased. We need this funding. This funding keeps rapists and other criminals off the street, and perhaps more importantly, the program can deliver some measure of justice to survivors of violence.

Unfortunately, this Debbie Smith Act authorization expired on September 30. And the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act passed by this House that included an extension of the Debbie Smith program has not been passed in the Senate.

I truly want to thank not only Chairman NADLER, but also Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, the entire Democratic Caucus for recognizing the importance of this grant program and moving H.R. 777 forward.

Despite its lapse in authorization, we have an opportunity to make sure that this successful program continues to help solve and prevent violent rape and protect survivors.

The Debbie Smith Act has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and I hope we continue that tradition today. I urge all of my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act. It protects women from sexual violence. It is important.

And, again, I thank all of my colleagues that have supported this legislation in the past, particularly ANN WAGNER, who has championed fighting sex trafficking and protecting women in other areas.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, the chairman said he wanted to remind me and others that the Debbie Smith Act was included in the VAWA Act that was passed out of the House. You didn't have to remind me. Unfortunately, as he knows and others know, the VAWA Act was loaded with liberal poison pills knowing that Republicans wouldn't vote for it, and it was a political act.

And so, to me, it was a political act to also include it in the VAWA bill,

knowing the VAWA bill was so controversial and it wouldn't be heard in the Senate. So, in fact, never in the history of the Violence Against Women Act has the Debbie Smith Act been included in that bill. And, in fact, I have been told that Debbie Smith herself did not want it included in the Violence Against Women Act, because she knew it was controversial.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, Debbie Smith's courage to share her story with the world has changed the lives of millions, and the law bearing her name has helped countless victims of sexual assault see their attackers face the justice they deserve.

The importance of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions is unquestionable. Since this program was first enacted, incredible progress has been made to reduce DNA backlogs. In my home State of Virginia, the FBI's National DNA Index contains more than 447,000 offender profiles and has aided in more than 11,000 criminal investigations.

This legislation will reauthorize this vital program and will continue to support State and local law enforcement agencies' efforts to reduce DNA backlogs and analyze DNA evidence collected from crimes.

As a former prosecutor, I know all too well how critical DNA evidence is to achieving justice for victims of sexual violence. I have been a strong advocate to reauthorize this program. I signed the discharge petition and spoke on this bill last month.

With passage of this bill today, we move a step closer to protecting people from violent sexual predators and allow justice to be served through our legal system.

It would have been better if we had taken up the Senate bill instead of pointing fingers and casting blame, but I hope that we will pass legislation quickly to get this grant money to the States and to those agencies that need it to make sure that justice is served.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I express my appreciation to the manager of our friends on the other side of the aisle, my colleague from Arizona, and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Let me say, first of all, to CAROLYN MALONEY, if we go down memory lane, we have been together on this issue from the very start. We know when you had Debbie Smith come when she was willing to speak at a time that, I would say, was most concerning in the early stages of this. She was willing to come to the United States Congress and to share her story.



And, Congresswoman MALONEY, let me thank you for crafting the legislation, working with any number of bipartisan cosponsors, some of whom are no longer in the United States Congress, but I remember as a member of the Judiciary Committee being very closely aligned and supporting this bill. And so we have made great strides. And the over 140,000 cases that have been solved is a testament to the great need of this legislation. There is no doubt.

And, of course, as we know from 2004—that is 15 years ago—that at that time, and continuing to a certain extent, the enormity of the backlog. Those of us who interact with law enforcement and interact with our district attorneys, we know that that has been an atrocious Achilles heel in providing comfort and justice to those who have been violated.

I am reminded of the forensic lab that we had in Houston; we had to do a completely massive overhaul for the Harris County lab to ensure that we were in compliance or that we were going after the backlog. That is the word that we should be focused on, the “backlog.” Backlog means injustice or no justice.

And certainly, as I have heard stories—just as recently as last night, I was on the phone with a constituent with a story that was just overwhelming, and she was trying to craft her next direction.

And so this legislation is answering the pain of individuals who have come forward—and even those who are not able to identify a person immediately, and the DNA provides that opportunity—and it reauthorizes the bill. It ensures that grantee states and localities prioritize DNA analysis of crime scene samples, rape kits, other sexual assault evidence, and also carries cases without an identified suspect.

I am glad that this bill is on the floor. But let me be very clear, we wrote a Violence Against Women Act starting in 2017 that was a monumental tribute to this month, in fact, which is Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

□ 1330

We know that there are many around the Nation who have experienced and suffered this. In fact, there was a recent trial in Houston with a family that was killed in totality, except one member, because of domestic violence.

We need the Violence Against Women Act. And I might take an exception to the fact that this bill is a holistic bill. It is a law enforcement bill. It is a bill of improving services to victims of domestic violence and dating violence and sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we have some very unique aspects in that legislation. We have counseling

for men and boys, something very unique. I can't view that as controversial.

We, likewise, have extended the protection of the arm of justice to Native American women.

And, let me just speak to law enforcement, because I speak to them almost every weekend that I am at home: \$291 million; and the creativity of prosecutors, local prosecutors, and law enforcement is amazing with those dollars.

So I believe that we can do both. We can continue to affirm and complement the enormity of the work of CAROLYN MALONEY, the years of work that we have worked with her and attacked the backlog, which none of us ever want to hear or see. We want no backlog.

We hope that this bill moves in the Senate, but it is not accurate that this bill, the Violence Against Women Act—there are active supporters of this legislation in the Senate, and I am looking forward to what we do best, working in a bipartisan manner to pass the Debbie Smith DNA bill and pass, to give relief to victims of domestic violence and others, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask Members to vote for Debbie Smith.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my friend, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

Along with my friend CAROLYN MALONEY, I introduced the Debbie Smith Act with the support of the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, RAINN.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her untiring work to end and prevent sex trafficking and other forms of violence against women, which I also support, and for her willingness to reach across the aisle to get things done. She is a warrior for vulnerable women and children, and I am so proud to work with her on this important legislation.

Debbie Smith programs provide much-needed funding for crime labs to process DNA evidence and strengthen the national DNA database, which has over 17 million profiles in it. It provides justice to victims. Under Debbie Smith, Congress provides \$151 million, annually, to State and local labs for DNA and rape kit testing.

Better technology has improved our ability to test and track DNA samples from crime scenes, and this data is making a real difference in the efforts to bring rapists and other sexual predators of sexual violence to justice. The FBI DNA database has been used in more than—are you ready for this, Madam Speaker?—465,270 investigations.

One in five rape kits entered into the national database generates a DNA match pointing to a serial rapist.

Since the Debbie Smith program was created back in 2005, nearly 200,000 DNA matches have been made in criminal cases, providing justice to victims in cases that may have otherwise gone unsolved.

But law enforcement can't keep up. Untested DNA cases have increased by 85 percent since 2011. In my own home State of Missouri alone, more than 5,400 untested rape kits are sitting in labs and in storerooms. We need the Debbie Smith programs now more than ever.

This legislation authorizes \$151 million for Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant programs, \$4.5 million for grants to State and local governments for training programs, and \$30 million for State and local governments to create programs to collect and use DNA evidence related to sexual assault.

The Senate unanimously sent their version of this legislation over to the House in May, but the House leadership did not bring it to the floor, allowing it to expire on September 30.

Both Democrats and Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, along with Congresswoman MALONEY, have led the charge on this reauthorization. It saddens me that the Judiciary members had to file a discharge petition to get Speaker PELOSI to put this bill on the floor.

This is not about personal ownership or asserting the House's authority. This is about getting something signed into law.

I worry that the Senate version of this bill includes accountability and performance measures that are not in the House bill. If the Senate bill were being voted upon today, the President could sign it into law tomorrow.

Looking forward, I implore both parties, House and Senate, to ensure the Debbie Smith Reauthorization gets to the President's desk as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, I thank Leader MCCARTHY, Ranking Member COLLINS, Chairman NADLER very, very much, and Congresswoman MALONEY most of all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in reauthorizing these programs that convict dangerous predators and help victims to get the justice that they deserve.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, only in Congress can we fight about something that I think we all generally agree on.

The bill the House is considering today will reauthorize the Debbie Smith grant program. I strongly support reauthorization.

But this law has a 15-year history of nearly unanimous support in Congress under both Republican and Democratic majorities and Presidents, but more importantly, it has a 15-year history as a standalone bill.

So my question is: What changed? When did it become so essential to become a part of VAWA? And if it is essential to be a part of VAWA, then why did we pull it out, and why are we voting on it again as a standalone bill?

On May 16, the Senate continued the bipartisan tradition and they passed a standalone reauthorization. We sat on that bill for months in the House.

House Republicans—I know; I was part of it. I was on the floor arguing for it before the last break, before the September 30 authorization lapsed. We tried twice to get it voted on.

As stated by the founder of the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, the House is using the Debbie Smith Act as leverage to get the Senate to pass other things that have nothing to do with DNA testing.

So, finally, today we brought the Debbie Smith Act to the floor, but even today, it is the wrong bill. The bill we are considering today has some serious flaws, but, more importantly, it is making changes to the Senate bill that nobody ever asked for.

Just like the Senate, it extends the program to 2024. However, for some reason, we have inexplicably omitted accountability provisions that Congress has required for these grant programs for nearly a decade.

These accountability measures are important. They include mandating a report on the effectiveness of the grant program to reduce the backlog of unanalyzed DNA evidence in sexual assault cases. They require recommendations to enhance the grant program, and they require the National Institute of Justice to define goals of the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction program and develop performance measures for each one of these goals. All of these are worthy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Dakota an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I can't think of an issue where accountability matters more than when we are collecting DNA evidence to get convictions of violent sexual offenders and to give some semblance of justice.

I am going to support the bill. I hope we get it back quickly. I hope we get to some resolution with the Senate. This needs to be done as quickly as possible.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am a little puzzled by what I am hearing on the floor today and, frankly, what I heard in committee this morning on a different bill.

The gist of that is, well, we passed a bill, but we know it is not exactly the way the Senate wants it; therefore, we

shouldn't pass it. We should only pass a bill exactly the way the Senate wants it; otherwise, it is only for show.

On this bill, look what happened. This reauthorization was included in the VAWA reauthorization, which we passed and sent to the Senate.

Ah, but that was political, we are told, because the Senate doesn't agree in every respect with the VAWA reauthorization we passed, so they won't touch it.

Well, I don't understand that. I always thought, from the time I was in third grade, that they should pass their own version of the VAWA bill. If it is different from ours, we go to conference.

But, no. No, we can't rely on them to do that. They have to have a bill that they agree with totally, or they won't look at the subject no matter how important.

Ah, but they introduced their own. They took it out of VAWA, and they did their own Debbie Smith bill.

Fine. We are doing a Debbie Smith bill because we don't agree exactly with what they did. They put in some new accountability provisions. We have always had accountability provisions in the bill, still there. It has always been the law. They are adding some new ones which we judge to be unduly burdensome on small providers. It is a judgment.

We should pass this bill. They have passed a different version of the bill. We can go to conference, iron it out. That is the way the process is supposed to work.

My Republican colleagues seem to think that we should never talk to the Senate; we should only pass a bill exactly the way they passed it. Or if they haven't passed it exactly the way we know they will want it and if we pass a bill differently, then it is just political posturing. That is nonsense.

This reauthorization bill is a good bill. It is the way we think it ought to be. If we pass it—they have already passed a different reauthorization bill. I regret that they didn't pass the entire VAWA reauthorization bill, but we can go to conference. We can iron it out.

If someone wants to argue that the provisions in that bill are better, let them offer it here, but not be heard to say we should only do exactly what the Senate wants. That doesn't make sense.

We are our own independent body. We were elected to do our job. This is the way we want to do it. This is the way we think the bill ought to be. We put it in the VAWA reauthorization bill. We have given up waiting for the Senate on that one.

They passed a Debbie Smith bill in a version we don't entirely approve of. We will pass our own version. We will get together. We will see if we can agree on it. That is the way the process ought to work.

If we pass this bill, that is the way the process will work, and we are more likely to get a reauthorization bill

than by standing here and saying: Don't pass this bill. Only pass a bill—which we won't do—exactly in a form that we don't like, exactly the way the Senate wanted it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don't think that anybody said that we have to do exactly what the Senate asks all the time, but it does make sense that, if a Senate bill has been sitting here for 5 months and it extends it, what we are doing in the House bill, plus it has accountability measures, that it would get done sooner and it would get signed into law sooner, and then the States and the local law enforcement would have the money sooner to get rid of the backlog of the rape kits. That is all we are saying.

So I don't understand the reason we are just not doing that bill, except maybe that they want an H.R. name, some House Member's name on it instead of a Senate Member's name on it. That is all I can think of.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my friend.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank our colleagues, CAROLYN MALONEY and DEBBIE LESKO and others, for their leadership on this important legislation to reauthorize the DNA Backlog Elimination grant program for another 5 years.

Madam Speaker, there are over 400,000 victims of sexual assault in this country each and every year. That equates to approximately one sexual assault per minute.

Debbie Smith was one of those victims; and although she underwent forensic examination, her kit went unanalyzed for over 5 years. The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that no other victim ever has to wait that long for justice again.

DNA analysis is an invaluable tool in identifying and convicting criminal suspects. The increased use of DNA evidence in criminal prosecutions has led to an increase in the collection and processing of DNA kits, which has led to a substantial backlog in the processing of DNA evidence, really, all across the country.

□ 1345

Fortunately, last year, after a 7-year effort, my home State of Ohio was able to clear its backlog of nearly 14,000 of these kits, but many other States haven't been so successful. In March, the GAO estimated that the number of backlog requests for crime scene evidence nearly doubled to nearly 170,000. Unfortunately, at the end of September, the funding authorization for this program expired.

While the legislation offered by Congresswoman MALONEY is an important

step in the right direction, this body really should have already considered the Senate-passed reauthorization so as to get it to the President's desk.

Continued funding will ensure that law enforcement nationwide will have the resources they need to process DNA evidence, prosecute, and punish those who commit these heinous acts of violence.

Again, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman LESKO for their leadership on this, and I urge its passage.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I will support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. While this is not the most expeditious manner to get this vital program reauthorized, it is the one that our Democratic majority has put before us.

I am not in the habit of holding rape victims and survivors hostage to play political games, and it really deeply saddens me that it appears that our majority may be doing this.

We had the opportunity to pass the Senate bill, and it has been sitting here for 5 months. We had the opportunity to show rape victims and survivors that we care about their plight. We had the opportunity to send the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019 to the President's desk today. Instead, our majority has decided to squander these opportunities.

It was bad enough that the Democratic majority allowed this authorization to elapse last month. It is even worse that we are placing this reauthorization into the realm of uncertainty.

There is no timetable or guarantee that the Senate will act on this bill. The one thing we know is that if we were voting on the Senate bill, it would pass today. It could have been signed by the President immediately. Unfortunately, we are now only marginally better off than we were this morning with regards to this reauthorization.

In the rush to impeach our President, our majority appears to have forgotten what we were sent here to do. Despite the petty motives sometimes of our majority, I will vote for the bill before us today and show support for the victims and survivors of rape. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, it is critical that we do all that we can to prevent sexual assault and that we ensure survivors receive the essential services they need, which is why we passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act earlier this year.

And I would remind my colleagues that the VAWA Act, which included the authorization for the Debbie Smith

Reauthorization Act, expired last September 30, 2018, when the Republicans had the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, and the President. So the fact that it lapsed was unfortunate, but it was also the responsibility of the Republican Party, which then had control of the Senate, the House, and the Presidency to get its continuation, which they neglected to do.

We continue to urge the Senate to do the right thing and pass the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, which includes the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

And we will also, again, today pass provisions to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act by advancing this bill today. In doing so, we reaffirm our commitment to this important program.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this bill, and to continue to fight to support the more comprehensive measures in the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of both the Judiciary Committee and a co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 777, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019," which reauthorizes the Debbie Smith Act and the Debbie Smith Backlog Grant program for an additional five years, through FY 2024.

These grant programs to address DNA backlogs and provide DNA training and technical assistance on local, state, and federal levels.

It is essential that these programs be reauthorized so that the backlog of unprocessed rape kits can be reduced and then eliminated, and perpetrators of sexual assault crimes can be prosecuted and convicted.

There is an ever-present need to continue robust funding for programs such as the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program in order to make sure victims do not fall through the cracks of the system.

Women who have been raped have a right to expect police to thoroughly investigate the case and prosecute the offenders; however, many rape kits across the country are never even tested, and the perpetrators never face justice.

Under the Debbie Smith Act, not less than 40 percent of the total amount awarded in grants must be used for DNA analyses of samples from crime scenes, rape kits and other sexual assault evidence, and in cases that do not have an identified suspect.

Madam Speaker, the number of backlogged DNA samples was in excess of 100,000 nationwide as recently as January 2014.

H.R. 777 reauthorizes for five years (until the end of fiscal year 2024) the following programs:

1. "Debbie Smith Reauthorization" grants for state and local DNA crime laboratories to address DNA backlogs and enhance their capacity.

2. DNA training and technical directed to law enforcement, courts, forensic scientists, and corrections.

3. DNA training and technical assistance directed to sexual assault nurse examiner/("SANE") programs.

In my congressional district, these grant programs have resulted in forensic laboratories being hired to clear much of the Houston Police Department's backlog of untested DNA benefit from this type of legislation.

Just within the past year, decades-old rape kits that sat untested in Houston have identified at least one-third of potential offenders in cases where there was sufficient DNA, according to the Houston Police Department.

In my district more than 6,600 rape kits have been cleared because of the funding made possible by the grant programs that H.R. 777 will reauthorize.

This record of success highlights the importance and continuing need to provide adequate funding so law enforcement agencies can conduct necessary DNA testing and training.

Madam Speaker, when enacted in 2004, the Debbie Smith Act was the first piece of legislation aimed at ending the backlog of untested rape kits and other unanalyzed DNA evidence.

Debbie Smith grants have played a critical role in states across the country.

The importance of the Debbie Smith Act is highlighted by the fact that delays in processing DNA evidence can result in delays apprehending or prosecuting violent or serial offenders or it can result in wrongfully convicted individuals serving time in prison for crimes they did not commit.

Law enforcement has increasingly recognized that the backlog of DNA evidence awaiting entry in state databases can prevent law enforcement officials from solving many heinous crimes—which has made the Debbie Smith Act recognized as such a crucial program.

Madam Speaker, the DNA Initiative is an invaluable tool for law enforcement today, and it will continue to be a legislative priority of mine. That is why I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 777 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to approve this critically important legislation.

Why We Also Need the Enactment of the Entire Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act

Although the country needs the provisions of the Debbie Smith Act, survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault need and deserve more.

The Senate must pass the full VAWA Reauthorization, which includes:

- Improving services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

- Giving law enforcement enhanced tools to combat domestic violence and sexual assault;

- Making vital new investments in prevention;

- Helping to better protect Native American women;

- Preserving and improving housing protections for survivors;

- Strengthening the health care system's response to domestic violence and sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 777, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 650; and

Adoption of House Resolution 650, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4617, STOPPING HARM- FUL INTERFERENCE IN ELEC- TIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOC- RACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 650) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4617) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 180, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

#### YEAS—223

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Allred	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Axne	Cicilline	Delgado
Barragán	Cisneros	Demings
Bass	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Bera	Clay	Dingell
Beyer	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer	Cohen	F.
Blunt Rochester	Connolly	Engel
Bonamici	Cooper	Escobar
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Españillat
F.	Costa	Finkenauer
Brindisi	Courtney	Fletcher
Brown (MD)	Cox (CA)	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Craig	Frankel
Bustos	Crist	Gallego
Butterfield	Crow	Garamendi
Carbajal	Cuellar	Garcia (IL)
Cárdenas	Cunningham	Garcia (TX)
Carson (IN)	Davids (KS)	Golden
Cartwright	Davis (CA)	Gomez
Case	Dean	Gonzalez (TX)
Casten (IL)	DeFazio	Gottheimer

Green, Al (TX)	Lynch	Sarbanes	Scalise	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Grijalva	Malinowski	Scanlon	Schweikert	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Haaland	Maloney,	Schakowsky	Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Wenstrup
Harder (CA)	Carolyn B.	Schiff	Sensenbrenner	Tipton	Westerman
Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schneider	Shimkus	Turner	Williams
Hayes	Matsui	Schrader	Simpson	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Heck	McAdams	Schrier	Smith (MO)	Wagner	Wittman
Higgins (NY)	McBath	Scott (VA)	Smith (NE)	Walberg	Womack
Hill (CA)	McCollum	Scott, David	Smith (NJ)	Walden	Woodall
Himes	McGovern	Serrano	Spano	Walker	Wright
Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Stauber	Walorski	Yoho
Horsford	Meeks	Shalala	Stefanik	Waltz	Young
Houlihan	Meng	Sherman	Steube	Watkins	Zeldin
Hoyer	Moore	Sherrill			
Huffman	Moulton	Sires			
Jackson Lee	Mucarsel-Powell	Slotkin			
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)			
Jeffries	Nadler	Soto			
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Spanberger			
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Speier			
Kaptur	Neguse	Stanton			
Keating	Norcross	Stevens			
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Suozi			
Kennedy	Ocasio-Cortez	Swalwell (CA)			
Khanna	Omar	Thompson (CA)			
Kildee	Pallone	Thompson (MS)			
Kilmer	Panetta	Titus			
Kim	Pappas	Tlaib			
Kind	Pascarell	Tonko			
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Torres (CA)			
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Torres Small			
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	(NM)			
Lamb	Phillips	Trahan			
Langevin	Pingree	Trone			
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Underwood			
Larson (CT)	Porter	Van Drew			
Lawrence	Pressley	Vargas			
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Veasey			
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Vela			
Lee (NV)	Raskin	Velázquez			
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Visclosky			
Levin (MI)	Richmond	Wasserman			
Lewis	Rose (NY)	Schultz			
Lieu, Ted	Rouda	Waters			
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman			
Loebach	Ruiz	Welch			
Lofgren	Ruppersberger	Wexton			
Lowenthal	Rush	Wild			
Lujan	Ryan	Wilson (FL)			
Luria	Sanchez	Yarmuth			

#### NAYS—180

Abraham	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Aderholt	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Allen	Flores	Lamborn
Amash	Fortenberry	Latta
Armstrong	Fox (NC)	Lesko
Arrington	Fulcher	Long
Babin	Gaetz	Loudermilk
Bacon	Gallagher	Lucas
Baird	Gianforte	Luetkemeyer
Balderson	Gibbs	Marchant
Banks	Gohmert	Marshall
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	Massie
Biggs	Gooden	Mast
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McCarthy
Bost	Granger	McCaul
Brady	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buchanan	Green (TN)	Meadows
Buck	Griffith	Miller
Bucshon	Guest	Mitchell
Budd	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Burchett	Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)
Burgess	Harris	Mullin
Byrne	Hartzler	Murphy (NC)
Calvert	Hern, Kevin	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Carter (TX)	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Olson
Cheney	Hill (AR)	Palazzo
Cline	Holding	Palmer
Cloud	Hollingsworth	Pence
Cole	Hudson	Perry
Comer	Huizenga	Posey
Conaway	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Reed
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Riggleman
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Roby
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Rodgers (WA)
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rooney (FL)
Duncan	King (IA)	Rose, John W.
Dunn	King (NY)	Rouzer
Emmer	Kinzing	Roy
Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford

Amodei	Gabbard	Reschenthaler
Bergman	Grothman	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bishop (NC)	Keller	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Takano
Eshoo	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Meuser	Timmons
Evans	Morelle	
Fudge	Peters	

#### NOT VOTING—28

Amodei	Gabbard	Reschenthaler
Bergman	Grothman	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bishop (NC)	Keller	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Takano
Eshoo	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Meuser	Timmons
Evans	Morelle	
Fudge	Peters	

□ 1419

Messrs. LUCAS and GUEST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HECK and Ms. WILD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 579.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 180, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

#### YEAS—226

Adams	Cooper	Golden
Aguilar	Correa	Gomez
Allred	Costa	Gonzalez (TX)
Axne	Courtney	Gottheimer
Barragán	Cox (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Bass	Craig	Grijalva
Beatty	Crist	Haaland
Bera	Crow	Harder (CA)
Beyer	Cuellar	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Hayes
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Heck
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Hill (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Dean	Himes
F.	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DeGette	Horsford
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Houlihan
Brownley (CA)	DeBene	Hoyer
Bustos	Delgado	Huffman
Butterfield	Demings	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Deutch	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Doggett	Johnson (TX)
Case	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Casten (IL)	F.	Keating
Castor (FL)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Escobar	Kennedy
Chu, Judy	Españillat	Khanna
Cicilline	Evans	Kildee
Cisneros	Finkenauer	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Fletcher	Kim
Clarke (NY)	Foster	Kind
Clay	Frankel	Kirkpatrick
Cleaver	Gallego	Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn	Garamendi	Kuster (NH)
Cohen	Garcia (IL)	Lamb
Connolly	Garcia (TX)	Langevin

Larsen (WA)	O'Halleran	Shalala	Wittman	Wright	Young
Larson (CT)	Ocasio-Cortez	Sherman	Womack	Yoho	Zeldin
Lawrence	Omar	Sherrill			
Lawson (FL)	Pallone	Sires			
Lee (CA)	Panetta	Slotkin	Amodei	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Lee (NV)	Pappas	Smith (WA)	Bergman	Keller	Steil
Levin (CA)	Pascarell	Soto	Bilirakis	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Levin (MI)	Payne	Spanberger	Bishop (NC)	Lowey	Takano
Lewis	Perlmutter	Speier	Collins (GA)	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Stanton	Eshoo	Meuser	Timmons
Lipinski	Phillips	Stevens	Fudge	Peters	Woodall
Loebback	Pingree	Suozzi	Gabbard	Reschenthaler	
Lofgren	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)	Grothman	Roe, David P.	
Lowenthal	Porter	Thompson (CA)			
Lujan	Pressley	Thompson (MS)			
Luria	Price (NC)	Titus			
Lynch	Quigley	Tlaib			
Malinowski	Raskin	Tonko			
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)			
Carolyn B.	Richmond	Torres Small			
Maloney, Sean	Rose (NY)	(NM)			
Matsui	Rouda	Trahan			
McAdams	Roybal-Allard	Trone			
McBath	Ruiz	Underwood			
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Van Drew			
McGovern	Rush	Vargas			
McNerney	Ryan	Veasey			
Meeks	Sánchez	Vela			
Meng	Sarbanes	Velázquez			
Moore	Scanlon	Visclosky			
Morelle	Schakowsky	Wasserman			
Moulton	Schiff	Schultz			
Mucarsel-Powell	Schneider	Waters			
Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Watson Coleman			
Nadler	Schrier	Welch			
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wexton			
Neal	Scott, David	Wild			
Neguse	Serrano	Wilson (FL)			
Norcross	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth			

## NAYS—180

Abraham	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)
Allen	Gooden	Mullin
Amash	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Armstrong	Granger	Newhouse
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Norman
Babin	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Olson
Baird	Green (TN)	Palazzo
Balderson	Griffith	Palmer
Banks	Guest	Pence
Barr	Guthrie	Perry
Biggs	Hagedorn	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Ratcliffe
Bost	Hartzler	Reed
Brady	Hern, Kevin	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Riggleman
Brooks (IN)	Hice (GA)	Roby
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hill (AR)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Hollingsworth	Rooney (FL)
Burchett	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Burgess	Huizenga	Rouzer
Byrne	Hunter	Roy
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Cloud	Katko	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Comer	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	King (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Kinzinger	Spano
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Stauber
Crenshaw	LaHood	Stefanik
Curtis	LaMalfa	Steube
Davidson (OH)	Lamborn	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Taylor
DesJarlais	Lesko	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Long	Tipton
Duncan	Loudermilk	Turner
Dunn	Lucas	Upton
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Estes	Marchant	Walberg
Ferguson	Marshall	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Walker
Fleischmann	Mast	Walorski
Flores	McCarthy	Waltz
Fortenberry	McCaul	Watkins
Fox (NC)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fulcher	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	McKinley	Wenstrup
Gallagher	Meadows	Westerman
Gianforte	Miller	Williams
Gibbs	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)

## NOT VOTING—25

Amodei	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bergman	Keller	Steil
Bilirakis	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Bishop (NC)	Lowey	Takano
Collins (GA)	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Eshoo	Meuser	Timmons
Fudge	Peters	Woodall
Gabbard	Reschenthaler	
Grothman	Roe, David P.	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1428

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, due to a roundtable on veterans suicide at the White House, which is part of my work as Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I was unable to make the first series of votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579 and "nay" on rollcall No. 580.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes between October 15 and 23 due to a long standing family commitment. While this would not have change the outcome, below is how I would have voted on each roll call.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 576, "nay" on rollcall No. 577, "yea" on rollcall No. 578, "nay" on rollcall No. 579, and "nay" on rollcall No. 580.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, The White House held a roundtable on the National Crisis of Veteran Suicide, which I was invited to be a part of. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579 and "nay" on rollcall No. 580.

## STOPPING HARMFUL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOCRACY ACT

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 4617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 650 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4617.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1432

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4617) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4617 is comprehensive legislation to strengthen the resilience of our democracy and protect against foreign interference in our elections, including by foreign governments.

These concerns go back to the earliest days of our country. In his farewell address to the people of the United States, our first President, George Washington, warned that "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence . . . the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of the republican government."

Mr. Chair, the 2020 Federal elections are fast-approaching. Public confidence and trust in our elections is of the utmost importance. We know that foreign adversaries are working to undermine that trust today. To quote former Special Counsel Mueller in July, "They are doing it as we sit here."

Our adversaries have a variety of tools to interfere in our democracy. These tools sow disinformation to provoke discord. Their goal is to divide us and attack our values of equality and freedom. Their tactics are calculated to undermine confidence in our democratic institutions so that they will collapse under the pressure of the division and distrust. The need to act is urgent.

We have been warned repeatedly about this. The former Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, wrote earlier this year in his Worldwide Threat Assessment, that as the 2020 elections advance, our "adversaries and strategic competitors almost certainly will use online influence operations to try to weaken democratic institutions, undermine U.S. alliances and partnerships, and shape policy outcomes in the United States and elsewhere."

He also wrote that their tactics will include spreading disinformation, conducting hack-and-leak operations, or manipulating data in a more targeted

fashion to influence U.S. policy, actions, and elections.

Earlier this month, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a report showing how the Kremlin's "information warfare campaign was broad in scope and entailed objectives beyond the result of the 2016 presidential election." This included using content to "push Americans further away from one another and to foment distrust in government institutions." The Senate report also found that "no single group of Americans was targeted by IRA"—that is the Russian group—"information operatives more than African Americans."

Among the bipartisan Senate report's recommendations, are for Congress to "examine legislative approaches to ensuring Americans know the sources of online political advertisements," and to harmonize the rules that apply online with television, radio, and satellite communications.

H.R. 4617 does just that. It builds on two other bills that strengthen the integrity of our democracy. In March, the House passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which included strong standards for ballot box election security, as well as provisions to shut down loopholes that allow foreign money, including from foreign governments, to influence elections here.

In June, the House passed H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, which sets strong cybersecurity standards for election infrastructure and provides resources to States to replace paperless and other outdated systems with voter-verified paper ballot systems.

Now we are turning to another element of election security. H.R. 4617 closes gaps in the law that allow foreign nationals and foreign governments to launder money into our elections. It promotes full transparency of the sources behind online campaign advertising, and it codifies a basic norm that political committees should report offers of illicit campaign assistance from foreign governments, both to the FBI and the FEC, rather than welcome interference from foreign governments.

Title I of the bill enhances reporting requirements and advances transparency and accountability. It establishes a duty upon political committees to report to the FBI and the FEC illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments, foreign political parties, and their agents. This provision of the bill was informed by various proposals that were introduced in the House, including by Representative JACKSON LEE, Representative SWALWELL, Representative MALINOWSKI, and Representative SLOTKIN. The bill also includes the Honest Ads Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that takes an important step to provide more transparency to digital political advertising, including the ads that the Russians targeted to Americans to build followers and the engagement of unwitting American citizens.

Title II closes loopholes and gaps in the law that permit foreign nationals and foreign governments to influence elections. It codifies existing FEC regulations prohibiting foreign nationals from influencing decisions about campaign spending. It requires the FEC to conduct an audit of illicit money in elections and report its recommendations to Congress after every election cycle. It prohibits foreign spending in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda; and it prohibits foreign spending and political advertising that promotes, attacks, supports, or opposes the election of candidates—or in the case of foreign governments, political advertising during an election year about national legislative issues of public importance.

I will note that some of these elements received bipartisan support when similar provisions were included in H.R. 1.

Title III deters foreign interference in elections. For example, it restricts campaigns from sharing nonpublic campaign materials, like internal opposition research and internal polling data with foreign governments and their agents, or those on the sanctions list, which can include oligarchs.

It also includes the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act—this was also part of H.R. 1—and prohibits knowingly false statements about voting and elections that are made with the intent to impede someone from exercising their franchise. It also provides mechanisms to ensure that state and local officials and the attorney general, as necessary, disseminate correct information in the wake of false information that might spread.

Mr. Chair, free and fair elections are the core of what it means to live in a democracy like ours. Free and fair elections are at the heart of what it means to be a citizen of the United States. It is our solemn duty to defend them.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I said many times since becoming the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the committee with leading jurisdiction over election legislation in the House, that the greatest threat to our Nation's election system is partisanship.

Why is partisanship the greatest threat?

Because when you have one side drafting partisan legislation to further their own political agenda, it causes inaction. When it comes to securing our Nation's elections, we cannot afford inaction. That is why it is imperative that our colleagues across the aisle work with us to find a bipartisan solution to preventing foreign interference in elections.

Unfortunately, that is not the route that the majority party chose to take this Congress. We saw this pattern first begin with the majority's H.R. 1. Over 700 pages of political initiatives to help them Federalize elections, then again, for the SAVE Act, a partisan election security bill, again attempting to Federalize elections and take power away from States. Both bills were drafted without bipartisan input and rushed through the House.

Back then, I told my colleagues if they were serious about reforming elections and making them more secure, we needed to work together. But here we are again with another partisan election bill that has no chance—zero chance—of becoming law. This time it is the SHIELD Act, a bill aimed at preventing foreign interference in our elections, like what we saw with Russia's misinformation campaign through social media in the 2016 Presidential election.

Look, it is safe to say that no one on either side of the aisle wants foreign meddling in our elections. Let me repeat that: I don't believe a single Republican or Democrat in this House wants foreign meddling in our elections.

And I want to be clear that there is bipartisan agreement on some of the intended goals of SHIELD. We should have increased transparency and political digital advertising, and we should close the loopholes that allow for foreign nationals to meddle in our elections.

But this bill isn't a serious attempt to address the type of interference that we saw in 2016, Mr. Chairman. It is jammed full of poison pills that the Democrats knew would make SHIELD a nonstarter. The SHIELD Act contains provisions that would Federalize elections, which as I have already pointed out, is the favorite solution of our majority for any issue.

This bill expands the powers of the Department of Justice to allow the Attorney General to insert himself or herself into individual races at the Federal, State, and local level. That is a complete Federal overreach of States' constitutional rights to maintain their own elections.

Think about it: The AG can come in to your race, every State and local race if they—he or she—wants to "correct the record." There are also provisions of this bill that I believe are unconstitutional and will have a chilling effect on our freedom of speech. For instance, we should not be proposing broad, vague regulations for disclosing online political ads that create unworkable standards for the American public.

Out of the \$1.4 billion spent on political digital ads in 2016, Russia spent \$100,000 over 2 years on Facebook ads. The majority of those were not even election ads, so it wouldn't have even been regulated by the Honest Ads Act.

Why would we then overreach and threaten American's free speech with this bill when it doesn't even address

what Russia did? We need serious election security legislation that will protect Americans' First Amendment rights. That is why I introduced the Honest Elections Act, which, if passed, would actually address the type of foreign meddling we saw in 2016 and highlighted in the Senate intel report.

□ 1445

The Honest Elections Act would strengthen existing laws, such as the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA; the Federal Election Campaign Act; and the Help America Vote Act. And it would modernize online political ad disclosure without infringing on free speech or requiring unworkable standards for Americans.

Our bill also increases monitoring of spending by foreign nationals in elections and addresses domestic interference in our elections, something the SHIELD Act fails to accomplish.

We may never be able to prevent criminal activity, whether that is in our elections or in our day-to-day lives, but we can provide our law enforcement with the best tools and resources available.

The Honest Elections Act is simply a better solution to preventing foreign interference in our elections than the SHIELD Act and its unintended consequences on Americans.

Again, I will say the greatest threat to our Nation's election system is partisanship because it is the partisanship we are seeing from the majority today that is keeping the American people from having bipartisan legislation right now that will prevent any potential foreign interference in our elections.

I keep hearing my Democratic colleagues talk about urgency, but this is the third time we have been here with a partisan election bill in the House that has yet to become law or make any real change whatsoever. If Democrats are serious about this urgency in protecting our Nation's elections in the 2020 cycle, prove it. Stop with the political games. Come back to the table and work with us on something that actually stands a chance at becoming law and protecting our Nation's elections.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would note that it was Justice Kavanaugh, in the *Bluman v. Federal Election Commission* case, who wrote the opinion that "it is fundamental to the definition of our national political community that foreign citizens do not have a constitutional right to participate in, and thus may be excluded from, activities of democratic self-government."

The idea that we are going to infringe on foreign governments' rights to participate is simply not legally supported.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a valued member of our committee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we know that there have been foreign attacks on our election infrastructure. That is a fact.

Knowing there are those out there who seek to rob us of our democracy, why would we leave our door wide open? Why would we not create a shield when our democracy is under attack?

The SHIELD Act, carefully drafted by my colleague and chair, Ms. LOFGREN, requires that political campaigns report any information they receive from foreign agents to the FBI so we can centralize information and stop attacks. Why would we not want to do that?

The SHIELD Act establishes strong penalties for online voter intimidation by foreign actors. Why would we not want to do that?

The SHIELD Act closes loopholes that allow foreigners to spend their money in our elections. Why would we not want to do that?

There are enemies out there every day trying to cast doubt on our elections. We have no excuse—no excuse—for not doing all we can to make ourselves less vulnerable.

This should be a bipartisan no-brainer, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to support the SHIELD Act to protect our democracy.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my good friend and a very well-respected member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend, colleague, and the ranking member for yielding this time.

I also want to say how thankful I am that we are in this body, in public, in front of the American people debating something that is very important to this Nation, that at least this process isn't held in the basement of this building, behind closed doors, away from the American people like some other issues are being held right now. I am at least still thankful for that.

But here we go again. It is another attempt by our friends on the other side to bring a bad idea to fix a bad situation. This is the third attempt for a Federal takeover of our election system.

It kind of reminds me of a popular commercial that is on television right now about these young people in a horror show. There is something evil after them, and they are outside of this spooky, old house and are like: "We have to go somewhere to hide."

One of the young people says: "Why don't we get in the running car?"

The others say: "That is a dumb idea. Let's go hide in the spooky shed behind the chainsaws."

Here we go, running to chainsaws again, running to chainsaws, getting ourselves in a worse situation. This would have done nothing to prohibit the Russian meddling in the 2016 election—nothing.

What would have made a difference is the Obama administration, which was advised that the Russians were attempting to hack into our system, that they were meddling. The Obama cybersecurity czar, he brought it to their attention and proposed countermeasures, and he was told to stand down.

We did nothing within the power that we already have to try to stop foreign influence in our elections. That is where we need to be focused.

This goes further than needs to happen by giving the Federal Government more power, more authority to take away the authority that has been given to the States to oversee their elections.

If these weren't enough concerns, this thing has been rushed to the floor with zero hearings. Let me repeat that: There have been no hearings, no fact-finders to get to the bottom of what would be the best solution to this problem. None.

It was a quickly scheduled markup that was rushed to the floor. And here we are again, working on a piece of legislation that would do nothing to fix the problem and has no chance of going anywhere in the Senate.

I suggest that we work together on a bipartisan basis to actually come up with a solution that works for the American people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would note that I think this bill would have done a lot to save us from the Russian attacks in 2016.

I will tell you one thing. The chairman of the Trump campaign, Mr. Manafort, gave internal polling and target data to a Russian agent multiple times while the Russians were buying ads. That would be prohibited under this act.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a much-valued member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Madam Chair for her exceptional work on the SHIELD Act, which is long overdue.

For 2 years, our colleagues across the aisle had control over the Judiciary Committee, the Rules Committee, and the House Administration Committee. They had no hearings about the sweeping and systematic campaign by the Russians to subvert and undermine our election.

The Democrats have brought forth the SHIELD Act. There is not a single partisan word in this act. We hear our colleagues declaring it is partisan. Name me one provision in this act that is partisan. There is nothing partisan about it, except that their response to it is partisan.

Now, some of our colleagues said that this is unconstitutional. A takeover, a Federal takeover, I think we just heard the words uttered by our distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Do you know who engineered the Federal takeover of the American elections? The Founders of America did, the Framers of our Constitution. In Article IV, they were the ones who said



that Congress may make or alter regulations governing the time, place, and manner of elections for the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

It was the Framers of the Constitution who put in Article IV that Congress must guarantee to the people of every State a republican form of government.

So, this is in the Constitution. We are doing our job to protect our elections, the sovereignty of our country, and the integrity of the democracy against foreign attack.

We should all be together on it, and I deplore the partisan response to this excellent legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my good and new friend, our newest Member of this institution.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to serve beside Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with my adamant opposition to H.R. 4617, otherwise known as the SHIELD Act.

I think my Republican colleagues would agree that this bill is misleading at best and should be more effectively monikered as the First Amendment suppression act.

Simply put, this bill is an extension of House Democrats' efforts to federalize the election process away from the States by substantially restricting free speech through governmental overreach. Furthermore, it does not actually do anything further to secure our elections from foreign interference.

In the buildup to the 2016 election, Russian operatives broke many existing U.S. laws in their attempt to spread misinformation. Nothing in SHIELD would provide additional resources to law enforcement officials to pursue these foreign actors.

Additionally, this bill will create a chilling effect on free speech by punishing organizations that have nothing to do with politics, and it mandates Federal overreach on a substantial scale.

The SHIELD Act even gives the Federal Government the duty of determining what qualifies as a legitimate news source.

To combat this recklessness, I actually offered a commonsense amendment that Democratic leadership would not consider for debate. It, simply enough, would have struck the word "legitimate" from the section because it is vague, overbroad, and open to subjective interpretation. Do we really want the Federal Government deciding on what is or is not a legitimate news outlet?

Two minutes is not enough time to fully detail the unintended consequences of the SHIELD Act, which I intend to vote against later on today on the floor.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would note that the legitimate press function referred to is part of the FEC analysis that has been longstanding. It is nothing new in this bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), a respected and valued member of the committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act.

Mr. Chairman, the world knows that our democracy was attacked in 2016 by foreign actors. We have a responsibility as a Congress to fight back against foreign cyber intrusions into our democracy and protect the sanctity of our elections. The SHIELD Act does just that.

Mr. Chair, right now, our country is facing an existential crisis. The question for each of us is: What are we going to do? What are we going to do to defend the principles and the Constitution upon which this country was founded?

The vote today on the SHIELD Act will be one of those moments that, some years from now, we will all look back on, and each of us will have to give an account for what we did. We must take a vote to defend our democracy from foreign interference and ensure that every American vote counts.

The words of my good friend and our dear colleague, Congressman Cummings, are swirling around this Chamber today. He said the following: "When we are dancing with the angels, the question will be asked: In 2019, what did we do to make sure we kept our democracy intact? Did we stand on the sidelines and say nothing? Did we play games?"

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, before I yield to my good friend from California, I do want to respond.

My great friend and colleague from the great State of Maryland mentioned that Republicans said that this bill is unconstitutional. Well, it wasn't just us.

Americans for Prosperity says this bill is unconstitutional. Heritage Action says the bill is unconstitutional. Even the ACLU said this bill is unconstitutional.

It is not every day, Mr. Chair, that you get those three organizations together on the same issue, but it is here. The unconstitutionality of this bill is from them and their remarks, adding to what we are saying here and debating on the floor.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my good friend.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I fervently agree with the premise of this bill. American political campaigns should remain among Americans.

In California, it is now common for admitted noncitizens, some of them here illegally, to inject themselves into campaigns and attempt to influence voters.

Perhaps we can all agree: You are either a citizen or you are not. If you are not a citizen, you are a guest. If you

are a guest, you are not entitled to participate in our elections or in the debate that influences them.

□ 1500

That is especially important in a nation where sovereignty is vested not with the government, but with the people. In most countries, the government is the sovereign. Here in America, the people are sovereign. But in America, our sovereign doesn't govern. It hires help. That is what all of us are. We are hired help.

And once we are hired, the sovereign people then discuss among themselves the job we are doing, and every 2 years this discussion informs their decision over whether to keep us or to hire somebody else. That is a unique exercise of American sovereignty, and it ought to be off limits to all others.

But where I fervently disagree is with this bill's use of governmental power to interfere with freedom of speech and association that is absolutely essential to the preservation of our liberty. Except for incitement to commit crimes, every person must be free to speak their minds.

If a foreign national inserts himself into an American political discussion, the remedy is to call him out, tell him to butt out, and denounce such conduct for the meddling that it is. The remedy is not to insert the government into the discussion over how the government is doing.

Once government seizes the power to tell the people what they can say or who they can talk to, we will have cracked the touchstone of our Bill of Rights, and that crack will grow until it shatters the bedrock of our freedom.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time remains.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 18 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to note that it was eight Justices who said, in the *Citizens United* case, that, while the First Amendment protects political speech, disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech. They were the ones, in the *Citizens United* case, who urged transparency. And it was Justice Kavanaugh himself who pointed out that foreign citizens don't have a First Amendment right to meddle in our elections.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who has done so much on our ethics and election reform effort.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her incredible work. Nobody has done more in this Congress to protect our democracy and lift up the voices of everyday Americans than ZOE LOFGREN, so I thank her for yielding.

The measure of partisanship here is not whether the Republicans have refused to get on this and it is a Democratic bill. That is not how you measure partisanship, because that is an

easy maneuver. You decide: None of us will get on the bill. It will be all Democrats that are supporting it or voting for it, and then we can say it is a partisan bill.

The measure of whether something is partisan or not is to go out and talk to the people in the country. And this is one of the most bipartisan bills you could possibly put together, judged by what people out in the country want to see.

Republicans, Independents, Democrats coming off of the 2016 election said to this Congress: "Protect our house." Not this House, the United States of America. "Protect our elections from foreign interference."

That wasn't just coming from Democrats. That wasn't a partisan voice out in the wilderness. That was everybody saying it, including Republicans and Independents.

So the fact that the Republicans don't want to get on a bill that Americans want to see doesn't make the bill partisan. It means that Republicans are not listening carefully enough to what the American people want to see.

We have tried now, three times—three times—to get our Republican colleagues to support these basic measures that would safeguard the integrity of our elections. H.R. 1, the For the People Act, contained many of the same provisions.

I get it. I heard what you said: Oh, the bill is too big. It does these other things. We love the election security stuff—we can go get those quotes from the H.R. 1 debate—oh, if you would just do the election security or the ballot box security measures to protect our elections, we would be on that in a minute.

Well, you got a second chance, a second bite at the apple with the SAFE Act. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for shepherding that through the committee, the SAFE Act, that would protect the ballot box.

But did Republicans vote for that to protect our democracy? No, they missed the second. Strike two.

So now we have the SHIELD Act to protect us against foreign interference, foreign money coming into our elections and trying to influence the outcome, misinformation campaigns coming from overseas, all this interference that we have to push back on, that the American people are concerned about.

So here you get a third chance to show that you want to protect our elections and safeguard our elections. This is the opportunity to stand up, support what the American people want to see, which is us protecting our democracy.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, there are too many comments I would like to make, so I will reserve them until we have a few less speakers. I am sure we will have a chance to debate some of the issues that my good friend and colleague from Maryland brought up.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman so much for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that, if I were in a court of law, I would tell you in advance that I am about to make an argument that is conditionally relevant, meaning: Bear with me. It will make sense when I get to the point.

So this morning, in committee—and I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee—we were having a hearing and ObamaCare came up. About five or six times, people said, on the Democrat side of the aisle, ObamaCare is being sabotaged by the Trump administration.

Well, I started thinking about that, and I realized that that wasn't really fair, that the problem was that this Congress and the Democrats in this House voted for a bill that mentioned the Secretary, HHS Secretary, 3,033 times; 974 times it said the "Secretary shall" and then went on to say something else.

According to Dr. BURGESS, he estimated that there were actually 262 different action items in ObamaCare voted on by the Democrats. None of the Republicans in the House at the time—I was not here, but none of the Republicans voted for it. 262 action items were given over to the Secretary.

So now we have the SHIELD Act, and you are saying: All right, Morgan, what does this have to do with the SHIELD Act?

I direct you to page 49, lines 10 to 25, Corrective Action: "If the Attorney General receives a credible report that materially false information has been or is being communicated in violation" of this bill, "and if the Attorney General determines that the State and local officials have not taken adequate steps to promptly communicate accurate information to correct the materially false information, the Attorney General shall, pursuant to the written procedures and standards under subsection (b)"—which, by the way, the Attorney General determines—"communicate to the public, by any means"—any means—"including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, accurate information designed to correct the materially false information."

What we are about to do in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is we are about to give the Attorney General the power to come into our congressional elections and to come into any election and start running ads, to run robocalls, to get involved in the election process, because I wouldn't want Attorney General Holder making decisions on my ads, and I don't think my friends, Mr. Chairman, on the other side of the aisle would want Attorney General Barr making decisions on their ads.

But that is what this bill does. It creates a situation where the Attorney General is going to come into our dis-

tricts if they think that one of us has issued a materially false ad and, instead of letting the voters make a decision as to whether or not I have done something wrong or my opponent has done something wrong or your opponent has done something wrong, the Attorney General is going to make that decision all by himself.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chair, when you don't like it, you are going to come back and say: Oh, my gosh, they are sabotaging the intent of the bill.

Well, forget the intent. Read the bill. Read the bill.

This bill has significant problems. It needs to go back to committee and be worked on some more. I appreciate it, but until this is corrected, I must vote "no" to try to protect our election system from having it being taken over by whomever the Attorney General might be.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note that the provision referred to relates only to the time, place, or manner of holding an election. So if you have a digital ad that says Democrats vote Tuesday, Republicans vote Wednesday, you can send out an ad saying everybody votes on Tuesday.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Maybe my friends have gotten a little bit of absentmindedness. This is volume I and II of the Mueller report, a distinguished veteran of the Vietnam war.

Page 174, volume I, it says specifically, well-documented: "On February 16, 2018, a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia returned an indictment against 13 Russian nationals and three Russian entities—including the Internet Research Agency, IRA, and Concord Management and Consulting LLC, Concord—with violating U.S. criminal laws in order to interfere with U.S. elections and political processes. The indictment charges all of the defendants with conspiracy to defraud the United States . . . three defendants with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and bank fraud . . . and five defendants with aggravated identity theft, Counts Three through Eight. Internet Research Agency Indictment. Concord, which is one of the entities charged in the Count One conspiracy, entered an appearance through U.S. counsel and moved to dismiss. . . ."

They were indicted on the basis of their interference in the 2016 election.

Let me be very clear. I rise to support this legislation, grateful that in

this bill is H.R. 2353. Duty to refuse or report foreign interference was language that I had that said that you cannot accept information from a foreign operative.

With that in mind, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4617, the "Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for A Lasting Democracy Act," or SHIELD Act and the underlying legislation.

I support this legislation introduced by my colleague, the Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentlelady from California, Chairwoman LOFGREN, because it:

1. Creates a duty to report illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments and their agents;

2. Helps prevent foreign interference in future elections by improving transparency of online political advertisements;

3. Closes loopholes that allow foreign nationals and foreign governments to spend in U.S. elections;

4. Restricts exchange of campaign information between candidates and foreign governments and their agents; and

5. Prohibits deceptive practices about voting procedures.

Mr. Chair, earlier this year FBI Director Christopher Wray testified before the Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is "a 365-day-a-year threat."

This is outrageous; American elections are to be decided by Americans.

That is why I am particularly pleased that H.R. 4617 incorporates the key provisions of H.R. 2353, the "Duty To Refuse And Report Foreign Interference In Elections Act" that I introduced in April of this year.

Mr. Chair, our friends across the aisle voted against Republicans voted against H.R. 1, the "For The People Act of 2019," which, *inter alia*, would secure our elections, and then against H.R. 2722, the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or SAFE Act, which closes dangerous gaps in our voting security into the 21st Century.

Today our Republican colleagues have another chance to demonstrate that they take seriously their oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

Mr. Chair, on January 6, 2017, representatives of the Intelligence Community advised the President-Elect that the Russian Federation conducted a sophisticated campaign to subvert our democracy with the goal of electing Donald Trump and defeating Hillary Clinton.

The Report issued by Special Counsel Robert Mueller on March 22, 2019 revealed that the Russians effectuated their goals by selectively disseminating stolen emails, with the end of maximizing the adverse impact this would have on Secretary Clinton's electoral prospects.

The Mueller Report further indicated that Russia's misinformation efforts also included the proliferation of fake online profiles on social media platforms, with the goal of echoing and amplifying politically divisive messages, so as to sow discord within the electorate and suppress the vote for Secretary Clinton.

As the Mueller Report lays bare, the Trump Campaign knew what Russia was doing and welcomed that assistance, did nothing to discourage it, did not report it, denied its exist-

ence and knowingly and happily accepted the benefits of the hostile foreign interference.

While some may tolerate this as awful but lawful conduct, none of the bill's sponsors or supporters do because it is deeply corrosive of our democracy.

In April of this year I introduced H.R. 2353, the "Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference in American Elections Act of 2019," to impose an affirmative duty to refuse any offer of election campaign assistance from any agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government and to report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation any such offer of assistance from an agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government.

This duty to refuse and report applies to candidates and any person working for, or volunteering with, a candidate for election to federal office.

The legislation also requires the Federal Election Commission to require that a candidate for election to federal office must certify quarterly that he or she is compliance with the above requirements on penalty of not more than 5 years in prison and a fine of not more than \$250,000.

Mr. Chair, the threat to our country is real, as documented in detail in the report issued by Special Counsel Mueller, confirmed by the unanimous assessment of our nation's Intelligence Community, and affirmed most recently by FBI Director Wray who testified in Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is "a 365-day-a-year threat."

It is past time to write into the books of law the sensible and self-protective principle that American elections are to be decided only by American citizens, and not influenced by foreign adversaries.

I encourage all members to join me in voting to keep Americans in control of our electoral process and elections by voting to pass H.R. 4716, the SHIELD Act.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have some folks who are on their way here to offer some more remarks, so, while we are waiting, I will offer my remarks on some of the comments that were made by my colleagues.

One of my colleagues talked about bipartisanship, that this is a bipartisan bill. It is not a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, the majority party clearly had an opportunity to put through our committee and onto the floor a bill that had Republican and Democrat cosponsors. Instead of doing that, they chose to follow the exact same path that they followed in the past through other committees and other pieces of legislation: They don't want to put real solutions forward; they want to put political talking points forward.

They decided to combine what my colleague from Virginia just talked about, allowing an Attorney General to participate, possibly, in Federal campaigns. That should scare every American, regardless of whether you are Republican or Democrat. Let's keep our elections run in the most safe and effective way possible: at the State and local level.

So it is not bipartisan. This bill is not bipartisan. There are 187 cosponsors of the SHIELD Act, and not a single Republican.

And that is a ploy? That is how we run away from bipartisanship? No, bipartisanship was taken away from us.

Now, how do you get bipartisanship? Well, you have hearings.

Not a single hearing was held in the House Administration Committee where we could ask questions to the social media platforms that are going to be affected by this piece of legislation if it becomes law. I certainly would have loved to have asked Mark Zuckerberg.

I tried to go over, today, to the Committee on Financial Services to ask Mr. Zuckerberg why in the world did Facebook or anybody at Facebook take a payment from Russia for overtly political ads. They took \$100,000 in payment out of \$1.4 billion in digital ads that were bought during the 2016 cycle. That check was cashed.

I don't know if they wrote a check; I don't know if they paid cash; I don't know if they paid rubles; but we ought to be able to get to the bottom of it.

I didn't even have a chance to ask before this bill was rushed to the floor. Too many questions.

□ 1515

If you want bipartisanship, you have got to earn bipartisanship by allowing us to have a seat at the table.

Now, it is not too hard to have discussions. It is not too hard to sit down and work out bipartisan solutions. There are only nine members of the House Administration Committee. We didn't have a chance to do that, to sit down and talk about our priorities. It was great H.R. 1 was brought up. That is the bill that was written in secret by special interests before we were all even sworn in. H.R. 1 had every single Member of the majority party signed on as a cosponsor before they even had a chance to read it. It wasn't even introduced yet.

And let's talk about what H.R. 1 did, what my colleague called strike one. H.R. 1. Every single Member of this institution who voted for that bill voted to put either your taxpayer dollars or corporate money for the first time ever in our Nation's history into their own political campaign coffers. That is not a strike to vote against that bill. That is a freaking home run. That is terrible. Nobody thinks getting more money out of politics would be solved by those provisions.

The SAFE Act, well, when the majority decided to write their bill after we had one hearing, they didn't even listen to their own witness about the efficacy of certain types of voting machines and the safety capabilities. They didn't listen to their own witness. They still tried to create a process that would have made safe election machines with a voter verified paper backup mechanism which would have made them essentially illegal after the year 2021 or 2022.

We know counties upon counties and election authorities in this Nation that have purchased these machines that their own witness said was safe, but that would be a waste of their own taxpayer dollars now because somebody in Washington that didn't consult with us, didn't allow us a chance to work in a bipartisan way, they would have wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars on voting machines.

My local Democratic election official in my home county of Christian County, Illinois, they worked with their local Republican county board to purchase almost \$300,000 in election machines that if the SAFE Act was signed into law, that expense would have lit 300 grand up with a match. That is wrong. Let's talk to our local election officials. I do. That is certainly not strike two. I think that is another home run, too.

Now the SHIELD Act. Again, I said it is not bipartisan. 137 cosponsors, all Democrats. We want to talk about bipartisanship, Mr. Chair, we can talk all we want. I want to see some action. I haven't seen some action. We talked in the Rules Committee last night about no hearings, no ability to question witnesses. We can come together. Nobody, and I mean nobody, in this institution, no one wants foreign interference. You want a bipartisan bill? Our next colleague who is going to talk was a cosponsor of a bipartisan bill that could have come to the floor, but we weren't given the chance.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), who is a leader in the Honest Ads Act.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congresswoman LOFGREN for yielding and for her leadership on this critical election security package.

Mr. Chairman, foreign interests shouldn't be able to influence American elections, period. That is not a Democratic notion. It is not a Republican notion. That is an American notion. We know that there is an election just a year away, and we know that just this week one of the world's most prominent social media companies acknowledged that Russia, Iran, China, and other adversaries are actively working to interfere in our next elections.

This is a no-brainer. It is time to take real action to fix loopholes and protect our elections from foreign interference. That is why the SHIELD Act is so important. There is a ton in this bill, and I am proud that many of the components of the SHIELD Act are based on bills the New Democratic Coalition endorsed, among them the Honest Ads Act.

Right now if a candidate or a group runs political ads on television that is publicly available information. The public and the press are able to access that information on who is buying the ad, how much they are paying. Same

thing on radio. But that is not true on social media. If an entity buys ads on social media, there are no disclosure requirements under the law, even though we know foreign adversaries are seeking to buy online ads.

The Honest Ads Act would change that, and that is why it is a bipartisan bill; 18 Democratic sponsors, 18 Republican sponsors, the chair of Senate Judiciary, the vice chair of the Intelligence Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, they see this as a way to strengthen our democracy and our national security. To enable law enforcement and the press and others to better detect and investigate foreign involvement in our elections.

The House has a choice to make, a choice to keep loopholes open and continue to see threats against our democracy or a choice to take action and pass the SHIELD Act. I am proud to be a sponsor of this bill.

I thank Chair LOFGREN and her team for their hard work on this, and I am confident the House will make the right choice and pass this bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will tell you, my colleague from the great State of Washington, you can't get much more bipartisan than Mr. KILMER. I certainly wish we would have been able to have the bill on the floor that my colleague spoke about that had an even number of Republican and Democratic cosponsors, but unfortunately, we don't have the opportunity to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, we are watching poison pills like the one that my colleague from Virginia spoke about where an attorney general can come in and decide to correct the record on Federal elections. I think that is scary for any American. That is not a solution.

I do believe that we will see this bill passed. I am not proud that this bill is going to pass, because this bill is not going to be signed into law.

And I know my good friend and colleague, the chairperson of the House Administration Committee, have discussed a couple of times about Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh. I think her and I agree with Justice Kavanaugh, that foreign bad actors, they don't have freedom of speech protections in the United States of America. But the sad fact, Mr. Chairman, is that if this bill were to pass into law, it would do nothing to affect the bad actors who interfered in our 2016 elections. Nothing.

Our bill, the Honest Elections Act would. We will positively affect those bad actors, and we will make sure they are held accountable.

If this bill passes, I believe the majority party would give more free speech protections to those foreign bad actors.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good friend.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The bill under consideration is an attempt to protect our elections from foreign interference. That is a goal that I certainly share, and I think all of us share.

In fact, I tried to offer an amendment to the bill that would have closed a gaping hole in the security of our election system. It is a weakness that basically rolls out the red carpet to foreign interference. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked my amendment.

My proposal would have prohibited the practice known as ballot harvesting, which is something that is only legal in a few states, where literally anyone can collect absentee ballots. In California where ballot harvesting is legal, anyone, including paid campaign workers and foreign nationals, are allowed to collect an unlimited number of ballots.

California Democrats have refused to put any guard rails on ballot collection, leaving it wide open to fraud and abuse by both foreign and domestic bad actors.

Every time I voice my concern about ballot harvesting, my friends on the other side of the aisle and the media keep asking for evidence of abuse.

Mr. Chairman, the reason there is no evidence of ballot harvesting fraud is because California Democrats have designed a system that doesn't collect evidence. If you collect ballots in California, you aren't required to give your name to the voter whose ballot you are collecting, and when you turn in that ballot to election officials, you are not required to give your name at that point either. There is no requirement to document the chain of custody of ballots. And there is nothing in the State law prohibiting foreign nationals from collecting and handling ballots. Let me repeat that. There is nothing in California law prohibiting foreign nationals from collecting and handling ballots.

You know, in reality, the only rule is there are no rules. Mr. Chairman, this isn't the Wild West. We shouldn't wait for fraud and abuse to occur before we act. By rejecting my amendment, Democrats have not only left a door open to foreign involvement in our elections, they have laid out the welcome mat.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), a star in our caucus.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I am proud to stand up in support of the SHIELD Act, which incorporates my bill, H.R. 4703, The DEFEND Act. The DEFEND Act, as incorporated here, would forbid paid internet activity by foreign actors, foreign political parties, foreign intelligence services and the like.

This is a problem because in 2016 across Pennsylvania users of social

media saw this image over and over again. It is the real image of a coal miner suggesting that miners were supporting the Republican nominee and getting together in huge rallies in places like Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

But the problem is, there were no rallies. And the truth is, the actual opinions of coal miners were much more mixed. They know, in fact, that they have been let down on issues like healthcare and pensions, by both Republicans and Democrats, and they have been supported and protected on those same issues by Members of both parties.

In fact, just today, the House Natural Resources Committee passed the Miners Pension Protection Act, and I was proud to stand with members of both parties in support of that.

Mr. Chair, the man in this image died in 1987 at the age of 57—too young—like most miners, of black lung. These miners have given a lot. We cannot allow the Russians or anyone else to take anything else from them and affect our elections.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN), a new Member of Congress from Michigan, who had a distinguished career in the intelligence community.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and thank her for all the work she has done on the SHIELD Act.

As a former CIA officer and Pentagon official, as the wife of a 30-year Army officer and the stepmom of a current Army officer, I know that when our country sees a threat, we have the responsibility to act and to consider ways to protect our country.

I think we have all said it many times here today, no matter who you are, what political party you are from, we can all agree that foreigners have no role in our political process.

I am incredibly proud to be supporting the SHIELD Act. Certain portions of it are modeled off legislation I have been working on since I first started in Congress in January, the PAID AD Act, in particular. It is the very basic idea that foreigners should not be able to buy an ad for or against a candidate in an American political election. That should be illegal, plain and simple.

Michigan was particularly targeted by these ads. They are divisive. They are hateful. They are meant to split us apart and stoke fears in our community. It is a classic in the playbook the Russians have used in Eastern Europe, and now they are using it here in the United States.

The SHIELD Act closes these loopholes that currently allow foreign entities to purchase campaign ads. I am thrilled to support it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS), a valued new Member of Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, people in small towns and cities in my home State of Minnesota and in neighborhoods all across the Nation are being targeted for manipulation.

□ 1530

Foreign governments have found a weakness in our national security. They are exploiting it by using social media platforms to influence Americans, with the hope that they will vote for foreign interests, not American interests.

Democrats and Republicans need to come together now—today—to do something about it. It is what our Founders—Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and others—would have demanded.

That is why I am proud to support the SHIELD Act, an important legislative package that includes my bill, the Firewall Act, that simply prevents foreign nationals from paying for online political advertisements, something to which my distinguished colleague from Illinois referred to just moments ago.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this historic and necessary package and help us build a wall, a digital wall, to protect Americans from foreign interference in our elections.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their comments today.

Look, there is a lot of activity and the opportunity to come to this floor and debate very important issues, and there are no more important issues than protecting the validity and safety of our election system here in this institution in the great United States of America.

You know what? We heard a lot about this process not being bipartisan, Mr. Chairman. Well, let's talk about what we have done in a bipartisan manner to protect our elections.

When Republicans were in charge of this institution, we worked in a bipartisan fashion to actually appropriate over \$300 million to go to our States, to work with our local officials, to partner with the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that our election infrastructure is safer than it was in 2016.

We all learned the lessons of 2016, and we worked together to put solutions on the table.

That is exactly what we should be doing here. But on the SHIELD Act, unfortunately, the Democratic majority did not allow us a seat at the table.

You know, you go to my home State of Illinois, where they have been raving about their partnership with this administration's Department of Homeland Security, and look at the 2018 election cycle. We had record turnout in a midterm election, and not one instance of foreign interference has been brought forth. So it looks like we have done something good together in a bipartisan fashion in the past.

I certainly hope, Mr. Chair, we could do that in the future.

Many of the provisions that my colleagues talked about and that I spoke about are just simply too egregious for us to support. We want to support a bill that has proper hearings, goes through regular order, and provides an opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to work together, just like we did to protect America's election systems for the 2018 election cycle.

I want to see results, Mr. Chair. I am not seeing results with the SHIELD Act.

Let's come together. Let's take another swing, take another crack at the bat. Let's hit another home run together. Because according to my count right now, that bipartisan investment of \$300-plus million that we worked together on, that is a grand slam. Let's start working on some more grand slams together.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I am disappointed that, apparently, we are not going to get support for this important bill from at least the ranking member and some of the Members who have spoken today on the other side of the aisle.

There are no poison pills in this bill, and much of the bill is made up of bills that had bipartisan support.

It is interesting to hear that somehow this is partisan because the Republican leadership refuses to step forward to confront the danger that we face from Russian interference in our elections and the possible interference from other nations. We have been told by the FBI that might include Iran as well as Turkey.

I listened carefully to my friend, the ranking member, about the money that was appropriated—and that was bipartisan; we supported that—in the last Congress for election security. Democrats included \$600 million this year for election security. We sent it to the Senate, and unlike last year, they now are refusing to act.

I remember back in law school that I was told by one of my professors, who I liked so much, that if you can't argue the law and you can't argue the facts, argue a lot. I think that is some of what we heard today.

We have had some hearings on these issues, three in the House Administration Committee. Although the Elections Subcommittee, which has been so active, did not focus entirely on these issues, it did touch also on these issues, in fact, just earlier this week. In the House Administration Committee, there have been 11 of these hearings.

To say that this bill threatens First Amendment rights is certainly incorrect. Now, I value the ACLU. We work with them very closely on a variety of issues, including the role of due process in immigration, and they have an important role in American society. But when it comes to campaign finance reform, they have a long history of opposing laws that regulate the raising

and spending of money to influence elections.

The ACLU filed an amicus brief in support of the Citizens United case. They opposed the effort by the Congress to get rid of the dark money in our elections. They, I think, misunderstand the issue of free speech when it comes to foreign governments.

I will quote the entire thing again that Justice Kavanaugh wrote: “The United States has a compelling interest for purposes of First Amendment analysis in limiting the participation of foreign citizens in activities of American democratic self-government, and in thereby preventing foreign influence over the U.S. political process.”

We don’t have to worry about whether the Russian trolls’ rights to free speech are being violated when we keep them from interfering in our elections because we have a compelling interest to keep the Russians and others from trying to subvert our elections, to hurt our country. We have a right to defend ourselves from them, and the SHIELD Act does that.

I would like to note also that elements in this bill would have prevented some of the misconduct or problems that occurred in the 2016 election.

I was interested that my colleague expressed concern that we didn’t hear from some of the platforms, that we didn’t hear from Mark Zuckerberg. He is correct. We did not call Facebook into the House Administration Committee. Frankly, if they had said, “We don’t want to do this,” I would have said, “Too bad.”

We need to set some rules that prevent the lack of responsibility on the part of some of these platforms. They accepted money from Russian influencers to place ads to harm our democracy. This bill requires them to make a reasonable effort to find out that the ads that are being placed are not actually coming from our foreign adversaries.

We, as I mentioned earlier, in this bill directly prohibit the sharing of sensitive campaign information by American campaigns with foreign actors. That happened in the 2016 election. We had the chairman of the Trump campaign, Mr. Manafort, sharing internal polling data with a Russian agent, sharing the playbook for the States at play with a Russian agent.

I have wondered a lot about what was going on there. I didn’t get an answer to that, but this bill makes that impermissible. This bill makes that a crime.

It also requires campaigns to report to the FBI when they have been contacted by a foreign campaign. We all know now that the Russians contacted the Trump campaign, and the President’s son said: “If it is what you say, I love it.” They supposedly had dirt on the Democratic opponent. They were going to funnel information into the campaign. Did the campaign tell the FBI? No, they did not.

Well, if this bill had passed, there would have been a requirement to notify the FEC and the FBI that the Russians were trying to interfere in the campaign.

Now, I would think that would be something that most people would think you would do anyway, that we shouldn’t need a law to require it. But, apparently, we do, and this bill would include that.

I want to mention the Honest Ads Act because the Honest Ads Act has been introduced with a broad bipartisan group to make sure that there is disclosure.

We have had a disclosure regime when it comes to broadcast TV and radio for a long time, but it did not extend to the digital advertising environment. That is a mistake because as information migrates to the digital world, we need to have disclosure there, too. The Honest Ads Act does that. It is incorporated in the SHIELD Act.

It is important. It requires the platforms to maintain copies of the ads for 4 years. It requires that there be a disclosure of who is paying for it. The American people have a right to know who is trying to influence them online, just as they do in TV broadcasting.

Does it make a difference? Yes, it does. I remember in my State of California, a number of years ago, there was an initiative to control smoking in restaurants. It was polling at, like, 80 percent, something of that nature. Then it came out that the backers of the initiative were the tobacco companies. They were doing it to undercut local ordinances that were stricter than what they were trying to put into place at the State level.

Support for the initiative dropped like a stone because people aren’t stupid. They know that they have to consider the source of the information when information is sent to them.

The American voters have a right to know who is spending money to influence them.

I would like to say that this measure deserves the support of every Member of this body. To say that the Senate will take it up—I would hate to think that the Senate cares so little about protecting our country from foreign influence that they would simply say no.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this bill. I think it is important for our country. I think it is essential for our democracy.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-35, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-253. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4617

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act” or the “SHIELD Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

#### **TITLE I—ENHANCED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

*Subtitle A—Establishing Duty to Report Foreign Election Interference*

Sec. 101. Federal campaign reporting of foreign contacts.

Sec. 102. Federal campaign foreign contact reporting compliance system.

Sec. 103. Criminal penalties.

Sec. 104. Rule of construction.

*Subtitle B—Strengthening Oversight of Online Political Advertising*

Sec. 111. Short title.

Sec. 112. Purpose.

Sec. 113. Expansion of definition of public communication.

Sec. 114. Expansion of definition of electioneering communication.

Sec. 115. Application of disclaimer statements to online communications.

Sec. 116. Political record requirements for online platforms.

Sec. 117. Preventing contributions, expenditures, independent expenditures, and disbursements for electioneering communications by foreign nationals in the form of online advertising.

#### **TITLE II—CLOSING LOOPHOLES ALLOWING SPENDING BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTIONS**

Sec. 201. Clarification of prohibition on participation by foreign nationals in election-related activities.

Sec. 202. Clarification of application of foreign money ban to certain disbursements and activities.

Sec. 203. Audit and report on illicit foreign money in Federal elections.

Sec. 204. Prohibition on contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connections with ballot initiatives and referenda.

Sec. 205. Expansion of limitations on foreign nationals participating in political advertising.

#### **TITLE III—DETERRING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS**

*Subtitle A—Deterrence Under Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971*

Sec. 301. Restrictions on exchange of campaign information between candidates and foreign powers.

Sec. 302. Clarification of standard for determining existence of coordination between campaigns and outside interests.

*Subtitle B—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation*

Sec. 311. Short title.

Sec. 312. Prohibition on deceptive practices in Federal elections.



Sec. 313. Corrective action.

Sec. 314. Reports to Congress.

#### TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Effective dates of provisions.

Sec. 402. Severability.

### TITLE I—ENHANCED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

#### Subtitle A—Establishing Duty to Report Foreign Election Interference

#### SEC. 101. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN REPORTING OF FOREIGN CONTACTS.

(a) INITIAL NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) DISCLOSURE OF REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACTS.—

“(I) COMMITTEE OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY.—Not later than 1 week after a reportable foreign contact, each political committee shall notify the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Commission of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact.

“(2) INDIVIDUAL OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY.—Not later than 3 days after a reportable foreign contact—

“(A) each candidate shall notify the treasurer or other designated official of the principal campaign committee of such candidate of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact; and

“(B) each official, employee, or agent of a political committee shall notify the treasurer or other designated official of the committee of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact.

“(3) REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACT.—In this subsection:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘reportable foreign contact’ means any direct or indirect contact or communication that—

“(i) is between—

“(I) a candidate, a political committee, or any official, employee, or agent of such committee; and

“(II) an individual that the person described in subclause (I) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes is a covered foreign national; and

“(ii) the person described in clause (i)(I) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes involves—

“(I) an offer or other proposal for a contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation described in section 319; or

“(II) coordination or collaboration with, an offer or provision of information or services to or from, or persistent and repeated contact with, a covered foreign national in connection with an election.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) CONTACTS IN OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ELECTED OFFICIAL.—The term ‘reportable foreign contact’ shall not include any contact or communication with a covered foreign national by an elected official or an employee of an elected official solely in an official capacity as such an official or employee.

(ii) CONTACTS FOR PURPOSES OF ENABLING OBSERVATION OF ELECTIONS BY INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS.—The term ‘reportable foreign contact’ shall not include any contact or communication with a covered foreign national by any person which is made for purposes of enabling the observation of elections in the United States by a foreign national or observation of elections outside of the United States by a candidate, political committee, or any official, employee, or agent of such committee.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS NOT APPLICABLE IF CONTACTS OR COMMUNICATIONS INVOLVE PROHIBITED DISBURSEMENTS.—A contact or communication by

an elected official or an employee of an elected official shall not be considered to be made solely in an official capacity for purposes of clause (i), and a contact or communication shall not be considered to be made for purposes of enabling the observation of elections for purposes of clause (ii), if the contact or communication involves a contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation described in section 319.

“(C) COVERED FOREIGN NATIONAL DEFINED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered foreign national’ means—

“(I) a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b)) that is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;

“(II) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal described in subclause (I) or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal described in subclause (I); or

“(III) any person included in the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury pursuant to authorities relating to the imposition of sanctions relating to the conduct of a foreign principal described in subclause (I).

“(ii) CLARIFICATION REGARDING APPLICATION TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.—In the case of a citizen of the United States, subclause (II) of clause (i) applies only to the extent that the person involved acts within the scope of that person’s status as the agent of a foreign principal described in subclause (I) of clause (i).”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to reportable foreign contacts which occur on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INFORMATION INCLUDED ON REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (7);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) for any reportable foreign contact (as defined in subsection (j)(3))—

“(A) the date, time, and location of the contact;

“(B) the date and time of when a designated official of the committee was notified of the contact;

“(C) the identity of individuals involved; and

“(D) a description of the contact, including the nature of any contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation involved and the nature of any activity described in subsection (j)(3)(A)(ii)(II) involved.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to reports filed on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 102. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FOREIGN CONTACT REPORTING COMPLIANCE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACTS COMPLIANCE POLICY.—

“(1) REPORTING.—Each political committee shall establish a policy that requires all officials, employees, and agents of such committee to notify the treasurer or other appropriate designated official of the committee of any reportable foreign contact (as defined in section 304(j)) not later than 3 days after such contact was made.

“(2) RETENTION AND PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.—Each political committee shall establish a policy that provides for the retention and preservation of records and information related to reportable foreign contacts (as so defined) for a period of not less than 3 years.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon filing its statement of organization under section 303(a), and with each report filed under section 304(a), the treasurer of each political committee (other than an authorized committee) shall certify that—

“(i) the committee has in place policies that meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2);

“(ii) the committee has designated an official to monitor compliance with such policies; and

“(iii) not later than 1 week after the beginning of any formal or informal affiliation with the committee, all officials, employees, and agents of such committee will—

“(I) receive notice of such policies;

“(II) be informed of the prohibitions under section 319; and

“(III) sign a certification affirming their understanding of such policies and prohibitions.

“(B) AUTHORIZED COMMITTEES.—With respect to an authorized committee, the candidate shall make the certification required under subparagraph (A).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to political committees which file a statement of organization under section 303(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30103(a)) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITION RULE FOR EXISTING COMMITTEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 shall file a certification with the Federal Election Commission that the committee is in compliance with the requirements of section 302(j) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

#### SEC. 103. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

Section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(E) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of subsection (j) or (b)(9) of section 304 or section 302(j) shall be fined not more than \$500,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(F) Any person who knowingly and willfully conceals or destroys any materials relating to a reportable foreign contact (as defined in section 304(j)) shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.”

#### SEC. 104. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle shall be construed—

(1) to impede legitimate journalistic activities; or

(2) to impose any additional limitation on the right to express political views or to participate in public discourse of any individual who—

(A) resides in the United States;

(B) is not a citizen of the United States or a national of the United States, as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)); and

(C) is not lawfully admitted for permanent residence, as defined by section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)).

#### Subtitle B—Strengthening Oversight of Online Political Advertising

#### SEC. 111. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Honest Ads Act”.

#### SEC. 112. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to enhance the integrity of American democracy and national security by improving disclosure requirements for online political advertisements in order to



uphold the Supreme Court's well-established standard that the electorate bears the right to be fully informed.

**SEC. 113. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Paragraph (22) of section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(22)) is amended by striking “or satellite communication” and inserting “satellite, paid internet, or paid digital communication”.

(b) *TREATMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.*—Section 301 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30101) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(B)(v), by striking “on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or similar types of general public political advertising” and inserting “in any public communication”; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B)—

(A) by amending clause (i) to read as follows: “(i) any news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any print, online, or digital newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical, unless such broadcasting, print, online, or digital facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;”; and

(B) in clause (iv), by striking “on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or similar types of general public political advertising” and inserting “in any public communication”.

(c) *DISCLOSURE AND DISCLAIMER STATEMENTS.*—Subsection (a) of section 318 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended—

(1) by striking “financing any communication through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising” and inserting “financing any public communication”; and

(2) by striking “solicits any contribution through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising” and inserting “solicits any contribution through any public communication”.

**SEC. 114. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF ELECTORATE COMMUNICATION.**

(a) *EXPANSION TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.*—

(1) *APPLICATION TO QUALIFIED INTERNET AND DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Subparagraph (A) of section 304(f)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “or satellite communication” each place it appears in clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting “satellite, or qualified internet or digital communication”.

(B) *QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATION.*—Paragraph (3) of section 304(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) *QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATION.*—The term ‘qualified internet or digital communication’ means any communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on an online platform (as defined in subsection (k)(3)).”.

(2) *NONAPPLICATION OF RELEVANT ELECTORATE TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.*—Section 304(f)(3)(A)(i)(III) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)(i)(III)) is amended by inserting “any broadcast, cable, or satellite” before “communication”.

(3) *NEWS EXEMPTION.*—Section 304(f)(3)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(B)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) a communication appearing in a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any online or digital newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical, unless such broadcasting, online, or digital facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;”.

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2020.

**SEC. 115. APPLICATION OF DISCLAIMER STATEMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.**

(a) *CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER REQUIREMENT.*—Subsection (a) of section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “shall clearly state” each place it appears in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting “shall state in a clear and conspicuous manner”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following flush sentence: “For purposes of this section, a communication does not make a statement in a clear and conspicuous manner if it is difficult to read or hear or if the placement is easily overlooked.”.

(b) *SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 318 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) *SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.*—

“(1) *SPECIAL RULES WITH RESPECT TO STATEMENTS.*—In the case of any communication to which this section applies which is a qualified internet or digital communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D)) which is disseminated through a medium in which the provision of all of the information specified in this section is not possible, the communication shall, in a clear and conspicuous manner—

“(A) state the name of the person who paid for the communication; and

“(B) provide a means for the recipient of the communication to obtain the remainder of the information required under this section with minimal effort and without receiving or viewing any additional material other than such required information.

“(2) *SAFE HARBOR FOR DETERMINING CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER.*—A statement in a qualified internet or digital communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D)) shall be considered to be made in a clear and conspicuous manner as provided in subsection (a) if the communication meets the following requirements:

“(A) *TEXT OR GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS.*—In the case of a text or graphic communication, the statement—

“(i) appears in letters at least as large as the majority of the text in the communication; and

“(ii) meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c).

“(B) *AUDIO COMMUNICATIONS.*—In the case of an audio communication, the statement is spoken in a clearly audible and intelligible manner at the beginning or end of the communication and lasts at least 3 seconds.

“(C) *VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS.*—In the case of a video communication which also includes audio, the statement—

“(i) is included at either the beginning or the end of the communication; and

“(ii) is made both in—

“(I) a written format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) and appears for at least 4 seconds; and

“(II) an audible format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

“(D) *OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.*—In the case of any other type of communication, the statement is at least as clear and conspicuous as the statement specified in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).”.

(2) *NONAPPLICATION OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.*—The exceptions provided in section 110.11(f)(1)(i) and (ii) of title 11, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor to such rules, shall have no application to qualified internet or digital communications (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by this Act).

(c) *MODIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.*—Section

318(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through radio” and inserting “which is in an audio format”; and

(B) by striking “BY RADIO” in the heading and inserting “AUDIO FORMAT”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through television” and inserting “which is in video format”; and

(B) by striking “BY TELEVISION” in the heading and inserting “VIDEO FORMAT”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “transmitted through radio or television” and inserting “made in audio or video format”; and

(B) by striking “through television” in the second sentence and inserting “in video format”.

**SEC. 116. POLITICAL RECORD REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104), as amended by section 101(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) *DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ONLINE ADVERTISEMENTS.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—

“(A) *REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.*—An online platform shall maintain, and make available for online public inspection in machine readable format, a complete record of any request to purchase on such online platform a qualified political advertisement which is made by a person whose aggregate requests to purchase qualified political advertisements on such online platform during the calendar year exceeds \$500.

“(B) *REQUIREMENTS FOR ADVERTISERS.*—Any person who requests to purchase a qualified political advertisement on an online platform shall provide the online platform with such information as is necessary for the online platform to comply with the requirements of subparagraph (A).

“(2) *CONTENTS OF RECORD.*—A record maintained under paragraph (1)(A) shall contain—

“(A) a digital copy of the qualified political advertisement;

“(B) a description of the audience targeted by the advertisement, the number of views generated from the advertisement, and the date and time that the advertisement is first displayed and last displayed; and

“(C) information regarding—

“(i) the average rate charged for the advertisement;

“(ii) the name of the candidate to which the advertisement refers and the office to which the candidate is seeking election, the election to which the advertisement refers, or the national legislative issue to which the advertisement refers (as applicable);

“(iii) in the case of a request made by, or on behalf of, a candidate, the name of the candidate, the authorized committee of the candidate, and the treasurer of such committee; and

“(iv) in the case of any request not described in clause (iii), the name of the person purchasing the advertisement, the name and address of a contact person for such person, and a list of the chief executive officers or members of the executive committee or of the board of directors of such person.

“(3) *ONLINE PLATFORM.*—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘online platform’ means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine) which—

“(A) sells qualified political advertisements; and

“(B) has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the preceding 12 months.

“(4) **QUALIFIED POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified political advertisement’ means any advertisement (including search engine marketing, display advertisements, video advertisements, native advertisements, and sponsorships) that—

“(A) is made by or on behalf of a candidate; or

“(B) communicates a message relating to any political matter of national importance, including—

“(i) a candidate;

“(ii) any election to Federal office; or

“(iii) a national legislative issue of public importance.

“(5) **TIME TO MAINTAIN FILE.**—The information required under this subsection shall be made available as soon as possible and shall be retained by the online platform for a period of not less than 4 years.

“(6) **SAFE HARBOR FOR PLATFORMS MAKING BEST EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY REQUESTS WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO RECORD MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.**—In accordance with rules established by the Commission, if an online platform shows that the platform used best efforts to determine whether or not a request to purchase a qualified political advertisement was subject to the requirements of this subsection, the online platform shall not be considered to be in violation of such requirements.

“(7) **PENALTIES.**—For penalties for failure by online platforms, and persons requesting to purchase a qualified political advertisement on online platforms, to comply with the requirements of this subsection, see section 309.”.

(b) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall establish rules—

(1) requiring common data formats for the record required to be maintained under section 304(k) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) so that all online platforms submit and maintain data online in a common, machine-readable and publicly accessible format;

(2) establishing search interface requirements relating to such record, including searches by candidate name, issue, purchaser, and date; and

(3) establishing the criteria for the safe harbor exception provided under paragraph (6) of section 304(k) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(c) **REPORTING.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biannually thereafter, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall submit a report to Congress on—

(1) matters relating to compliance with and the enforcement of the requirements of section 304(k) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a);

(2) recommendations for any modifications to such section to assist in carrying out its purposes; and

(3) identifying ways to bring transparency and accountability to political advertisements distributed online for free.

**SEC. 117. PREVENTING CONTRIBUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE FORM OF ONLINE ADVERTISING.**

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF BROADCAST STATIONS, PROVIDERS OF CABLE AND SATELLITE TELEVISION, AND ONLINE PLATFORMS.**—

“(1) **RESPONSIBILITIES DESCRIBED.**—Each television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform (as defined in section 304(k)(3)) shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that communications described in section 318(a) and made available by such station, provider, or platform are not

purchased by a foreign national, directly or indirectly. For purposes of the previous sentence, a station, provider, or online platform shall not be considered to have made reasonable efforts under this paragraph in the case of the availability of a communication unless the station, provider, or online platform directly inquires from the individual or entity making such purchase whether the purchase is to be made by a foreign national, directly or indirectly.

“(2) **SPECIAL RULES FOR DISBURSEMENT PAID WITH CREDIT CARD.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform shall be considered to have made reasonable efforts under such paragraph in the case of a purchase of the availability of a communication which is made with a credit card if—

“(A) the individual or entity making such purchase is required, at the time of making such purchase, to disclose the credit verification value of such credit card; and

“(B) the billing address associated with such credit card is located in the United States or, in the case of a purchase made by an individual who is a United States citizen living outside of the United States, the individual provides the television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform with the United States mailing address the individual uses for voter registration purposes.”.

**TITLE II—CLOSING LOOPHOLES ALLOWING SPENDING BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTIONS**

**SEC. 201. CLARIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON PARTICIPATION BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES.**

(a) **CLARIFICATION OF PROHIBITION.**—Section 319(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) a foreign national to direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decision making process of any person (including a corporation, labor organization, political committee, or political organization) with regard to such person’s Federal or non-Federal election-related activity, including any decision concerning the making of contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements in connection with an election for any Federal, State, or local office or any decision concerning the administration of a political committee.”.

(b) **CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—Section 319 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30121), as amended by section 117, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE REQUIRED PRIOR TO CARRYING OUT ACTIVITY.**—Prior to the making in connection with an election for Federal office of any contribution, donation, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement for an electioneering communication by a corporation, labor organization (as defined in section 316(b)), limited liability corporation, or partnership during a year, the chief executive officer of the corporation, labor organization, limited liability corporation, or partnership (or, if the corporation, labor organization, limited liability corporation, or partnership does not have a chief executive officer, the highest ranking official of the corporation, labor organization, limited liability corporation, or partnership), shall file a certification with the Commission, under penalty of perjury, that a foreign national did not direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decision making process relating to such activity in violation of subsection (a)(3), unless the chief executive officer has previously filed such a certification during that calendar year.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 202. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES.**

(a) **APPLICATION TO DISBURSEMENTS TO SUPER PACS.**—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: “, including any disbursement to a political committee which accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act (or any disbursement to or on behalf of any account of a political committee which is established for the purpose of accepting such donations or contributions);”.

(b) **CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH CORPORATE PACS MAY MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.**—Section 316(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30118(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) A separate segregated fund established by a corporation may not make a contribution or expenditure during a year unless the fund has certified to the Commission the following during the year:

“(A) Each individual who manages the fund, and who is responsible for exercising decision-making authority for the fund, is a citizen of the United States or is lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States.

“(B) No foreign national under section 319 participates in any way in the decisionmaking processes of the fund with regard to contributions or expenditures under this Act.

“(C) The fund does not solicit or accept recommendations from any foreign national under section 319 with respect to the contributions or expenditures made by the fund.

“(D) Any member of the board of directors of the corporation who is a foreign national under section 319 abstains from voting on matters concerning the fund or its activities.”.

**SEC. 203. AUDIT AND REPORT ON ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 319 the following new section:

**“SEC. 319A. AUDIT AND REPORT ON DISBURSEMENTS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

“(a) **AUDIT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall conduct an audit after each Federal election cycle to determine the incidence of illicit foreign money in such Federal election cycle.

“(2) **PROCEDURES.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Commission shall conduct random audits of any disbursements required to be reported under this Act, in accordance with procedures established by the Commission.

“(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the end of each Federal election cycle, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report containing—

“(1) results of the audit required by subsection (a)(1); and

“(2) recommendations to address the presence of illicit foreign money in elections, as appropriate.

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section:

“(1) The term ‘Federal election cycle’ means the period which begins on the day after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office and which ends on the date of the first regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held after such date.

“(2) The term ‘illicit foreign money’ means any disbursement by a foreign national (as defined in section 319(b)) prohibited under such section.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the

Federal election cycle that began during November 2018, and each succeeding Federal election cycle.

**SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “election” and inserting the following: “election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

**SEC. 205. EXPANSION OF LIMITATIONS ON FOREIGN NATIONALS PARTICIPATING IN POLITICAL ADVERTISING.**

(a) **DISBURSEMENTS DESCRIBED.**—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) an expenditure;

“(D) an independent expenditure;

“(E) a disbursement for an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(j)(3));

“(F) a disbursement for a communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on a website, web application, or digital application that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and is disseminated within 60 days before a general, special or runoff election for the office sought by the candidate or 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate for the office sought by the candidate;

“(G) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable or satellite communication, or for a communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on a website, web application, or digital application, that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy);

“(H) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for any communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on an online platform (as defined in section 304(k)(3)), that discusses a national legislative issue of public importance in a year in which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held, but only if the disbursement is made by a covered foreign national described in section 304(j)(3)(C); or

“(I) a disbursement by a covered foreign national described in section 304(j)(3)(C) to compensate any person for internet activity that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the activity communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy);”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**TITLE III—DETERRING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS**

**Subtitle A—Deterrence Under Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971**

**SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON EXCHANGE OF CAMPAIGN INFORMATION BETWEEN CANDIDATES AND FOREIGN POWERS.**

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121), as amended by section 117 and section 201(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **RESTRICTIONS ON EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN CANDIDATES AND FOREIGN POWERS.**—

“(1) **TREATMENT OF OFFER TO SHARE NON-PUBLIC CAMPAIGN MATERIAL AS SOLICITATION OF CONTRIBUTION FROM FOREIGN NATIONAL.**—If a candidate or an individual affiliated with the campaign of a candidate, or if a political committee or an individual affiliated with a political committee, provides or offers to provide non-public campaign material to a covered foreign national or to another person whom the candidate, committee, or individual knows or has reason to know will provide the material to a covered foreign national, the candidate, committee, or individual (as the case may be) shall be considered for purposes of this section to have solicited a contribution or donation described in subsection (a)(1)(A) from a foreign national.

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

“(A) The term ‘candidate’ means an individual who seeks nomination for, or election to, any Federal, State, or local public office.

“(B) The term ‘covered foreign national’ has the meaning given such term in section 304(j)(3)(C).

“(C) The term ‘individual affiliated with a campaign’ means, with respect to a candidate, an employee of any organization legally authorized under Federal, State, or local law to support the candidate’s campaign for nomination for, or election to, any Federal, State, or local public office, as well as any independent contractor of such an organization and any individual who performs services on behalf of the organization, whether paid or unpaid.

“(D) The term ‘individual affiliated with a political committee’ means, with respect to a political committee, an employee of the committee as well as any independent contractor of the committee and any individual who performs services on behalf of the committee, whether paid or unpaid.

“(E) The term ‘nonpublic campaign material’ means, with respect to a candidate or a political committee, campaign material that is produced by the candidate or the committee or produced at the candidate or committee’s expense or request which is not distributed or made available to the general public or otherwise in the public domain, including polling and focus group data and opposition research, except that such term does not include material produced for purposes of consultations relating solely to the candidate’s or committee’s position on a legislative or policy matter.”.

**SEC. 302. CLARIFICATION OF STANDARD FOR DETERMINING EXISTENCE OF COORDINATION BETWEEN CAMPAIGNS AND OUTSIDE INTERESTS.**

Section 315(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) For purposes of paragraph (7), an expenditure or disbursement may be considered to have been made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or coordinated with, a person without regard to whether or not the cooperation, consultation, or coordination is carried out pursuant to agreement or formal collaboration.”.

**Subtitle B—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation**

**SEC. 311. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 312. PROHIBITION ON DECEPTIVE PRACTICES IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.**

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Subsection (b) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No person” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No person”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) **FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING FEDERAL ELECTIONS.**—

“(A) **PROHIBITION.**—No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall, within 60 days before an election described in paragraph (5), by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, communicate or cause to be communicated information described in subparagraph (B), or produce information described in subparagraph (B) with the intent that such information be communicated, if such person—

“(i) knows such information to be materially false; and

“(ii) has the intent to impede or prevent another person from exercising the right to vote in an election described in paragraph (5).

“(B) **INFORMATION DESCRIBED.**—Information is described in this subparagraph if such information is regarding—

“(i) the time, place, or manner of holding any election described in paragraph (5); or

“(ii) the qualifications for or restrictions on voter eligibility for any such election, including—

“(I) any criminal penalties associated with voting in any such election; or

“(II) information regarding a voter’s registration status or eligibility.

“(3) **FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING PUBLIC ENDORSEMENTS.**—

“(A) **PROHIBITION.**—No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall, within 60 days before an election described in paragraph (5), by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, communicate, or cause to be communicated, a materially false statement about an endorsement, if such person—

“(i) knows such statement to be false; and

“(ii) has the intent to impede or prevent another person from exercising the right to vote in an election described in paragraph (5).

“(B) **DEFINITION OF ‘MATERIALLY FALSE’.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a statement about an endorsement is ‘materially false’ if, with respect to an upcoming election described in paragraph (5)—

“(i) the statement states that a specifically named person, political party, or organization has endorsed the election of a specific candidate for a Federal office described in such paragraph; and

“(ii) such person, political party, or organization has not endorsed the election of such candidate.

“(4) **HINDERING, INTERFERING WITH, OR PREVENTING VOTING OR REGISTERING TO VOTE.**—No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intentionally hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote in an election described in paragraph (5).

“(5) **ELECTION DESCRIBED.**—An election described in this paragraph is any general, primary, runoff, or special election held solely or in part for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Commissioner from a Territory or possession.”.

(b) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (c) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “Whenever any person” and inserting the following:

“(1) Whenever any person”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Any person aggrieved by a violation of subsection (b)(2), (b)(3), or (b)(4) may institute a civil action for preventive relief, including an

application in a United States district court for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order. In any such action, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsection (e) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(e)) is amended by striking "subsection (c)" and inserting "subsection (c)(1)".

(B) Subsection (g) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(g)) is amended by striking "subsection (c)" and inserting "subsection (c)(1)".

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

(1) DECEPTIVE ACTS.—Section 594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Whoever" and inserting the following:

"(a) INTIMIDATION.—Whoever";

(B) in subsection (a), as inserted by subparagraph (A), by striking "at any election" and inserting "at any general, primary, run-off, or special election"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) DECEPTIVE ACTS.—

"(1) FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING FEDERAL ELECTIONS.—

"(A) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, within 60 days before an election described in subsection (e), by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, to communicate or cause to be communicated information described in subparagraph (B), or produce information described in subparagraph (B) with the intent that such information be communicated, if such person—

"(i) knows such information to be materially false; and

"(ii) has the intent to mislead voters, or the intent to impede or prevent another person from exercising the right to vote in an election described in subsection (e).

"(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—Information is described in this subparagraph if such information is regarding—

"(i) the time or place of holding any election described in subsection (e); or

"(ii) the qualifications for or restrictions on voter eligibility for any such election, including—

"(I) any criminal penalties associated with voting in any such election; or

"(II) information regarding a voter's registration status or eligibility.

"(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) HINDERING, INTERFERING WITH, OR PREVENTING VOTING OR REGISTERING TO VOTE.—

"(1) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, to intentionally hinder, interfere with, or prevent another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote in an election described in subsection (e).

"(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts to commit any offense described in subsection (a), (b)(1), or (c)(1) shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense that the person attempted to commit.

"(e) ELECTION DESCRIBED.—An election described in this subsection is any general, primary, run-off, or special election held solely or in part for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives,

or Delegate or Commissioner from a Territory or possession."

(2) MODIFICATION OF PENALTY FOR VOTER INTIMIDATION.—Section 594(a) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking "fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year" and inserting "fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years".

(3) SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(A) REVIEW AND AMENDMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Sentencing Commission, pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of any offense under section 594 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(B) AUTHORIZATION.—The United States Sentencing Commission may amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (28 U.S.C. 994 note) as though the authority under that section had not expired.

(4) PAYMENTS FOR REFRAINING FROM VOTING.—Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10307) is amended by striking "either for registration to vote or for voting" and inserting "for registration to vote, for voting, or for not voting".

**SEC. 313. CORRECTIVE ACTION.**

(a) CORRECTIVE ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Attorney General receives a credible report that materially false information has been or is being communicated in violation of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2004(b) of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(b)), as added by section 312(a), and if the Attorney General determines that State and local election officials have not taken adequate steps to promptly communicate accurate information to correct the materially false information, the Attorney General shall, pursuant to the written procedures and standards under subsection (b), communicate to the public, by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, accurate information designed to correct the materially false information.

(2) COMMUNICATION OF CORRECTIVE INFORMATION.—Any information communicated by the Attorney General under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall—

(i) be accurate and objective;

(ii) consist of only the information necessary to correct the materially false information that has been or is being communicated; and

(iii) to the extent practicable, be by a means that the Attorney General determines will reach the persons to whom the materially false information has been or is being communicated; and

(B) shall not be designed to favor or disfavor any particular candidate, organization, or political party.

(b) WRITTEN PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR TAKING CORRECTIVE ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish written procedures and standards for determining when and how corrective action will be taken under this section.

(2) INCLUSION OF APPROPRIATE DEADLINES.—The procedures and standards under paragraph (1) shall include appropriate deadlines, based in part on the number of days remaining before the upcoming election.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the procedures and standards under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall consult with the Election Assistance Commission, State and local election officials, civil rights organizations, voting rights groups, voter protection groups, and other interested community organizations.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle.

**SEC. 314. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after each general election for Federal office, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report compiling all allegations received by the Attorney General of deceptive practices described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 2004(b) of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(b)), as added by section 312(a), relating to the general election for Federal office and any primary, run-off, or a special election for Federal office held in the 2 years preceding the general election.

(b) CONTENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(A) a description of each allegation of a deceptive practice described in subsection (a), including the geographic location, racial and ethnic composition, and language minority-group membership of the persons toward whom the alleged deceptive practice was directed;

(B) the status of the investigation of each allegation described in subparagraph (A);

(C) a description of each corrective action taken by the Attorney General under section 4(a) in response to an allegation described in subparagraph (A);

(D) a description of each referral of an allegation described in subparagraph (A) to other Federal, State, or local agencies;

(E) to the extent information is available, a description of any civil action instituted under section 2004(c)(2) of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(c)(2)), as added by section 312(b), in connection with an allegation described in subparagraph (A); and

(F) a description of any criminal prosecution instituted under section 594 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 3(c), in connection with the receipt of an allegation described in subparagraph (A) by the Attorney General.

(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall not include in a report submitted under subsection (a) any information protected from disclosure by rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or any Federal criminal statute.

(B) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN OTHER INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may determine that the following information shall not be included in a report submitted under subsection (a):

(i) Any information that is privileged.

(ii) Any information concerning an ongoing investigation.

(iii) Any information concerning a criminal or civil proceeding conducted under seal.

(iv) Any other nonpublic information that the Attorney General determines the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to infringe on the rights of any individual or adversely affect the integrity of a pending or future criminal investigation.

(c) REPORT MADE PUBLIC.—On the date that the Attorney General submits the report under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall also make the report publicly available through the Internet and other appropriate means.

**Subtitle C—Inadmissibility and Deportability of Aliens Engaging in Improper Election Interference**

**SEC. 321. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN UNITED STATES ELECTIONS.**

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(H) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.—Any alien who a consular

officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe, is seeking admission to the United States to engage in improper interference in a United States election, or has engaged in improper interference in a United States election, is inadmissible.”.

(b) **DEPORTABILITY.**—Section 237(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.**—Any alien who has engaged, is engaged, or at any time after admission engages in improper interference in a United States election is deportable.”.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—Section 101(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(53) The term ‘improper interference in a United States election’ means conduct by an alien that—

“(A)(i) violates Federal criminal, voting rights, or campaign finance law, or

“(ii) is performed by any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign government or criminal enterprise; and

“(B) includes any covert, fraudulent, deceptive, or unlawful act or attempted act, undertaken with the purpose or effect of undermining public confidence in election processes or institutions, or influencing, undermining confidence in, or altering the result or reported result of, a general or primary Federal, State, or local election or caucus, including—

“(i) the campaign of a candidate; or

“(ii) a ballot measure, including an amendment, a bond issue, an initiative, a recall, a referendum or a referendum.”.

#### **TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

##### **SEC. 401. EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROVISIONS.**

Each provision of this Act and each amendment made by a provision of this Act shall take effect on the effective date provided under this Act for such provision or such amendment without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission, the Attorney General, or any other person has promulgated regulations to carry out such provision or such amendment.

##### **SEC. 402. SEVERABILITY.**

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, and the application of the provisions to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-253. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 54, insert after line 14 the following:

#### **Subtitle C—Notifying States of Disinformation Campaigns by Foreign Nationals**

##### **SEC. 321. NOTIFYING STATES OF DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGNS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

(a) **REQUIRING DISCLOSURE.**—If the Federal Election Commission makes a determination that a foreign national has initiated or has attempted to initiate a disinformation campaign targeted at an election for public office held in a State, the Commission shall notify the State involved of the determination not later than 30 days after making the determination.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section the term “foreign national” has the meaning given such term in section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(b)).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1545

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, as the first amendment, I don't want to belabor many of the points that have been brought up in the general debate by my friend from Illinois and my very good friend from the Bay Area. I do want to say, as someone who has been in elected office in the San Francisco Bay Area for a long time, where so many of the innovations around social platforms and communications have taken place—much of it in Ms. LOFGREN's district—how proud I have been of them. But how now—appropriately I think—skeptical I am of their ability to unilaterally, or merely by themselves, enforce the proper protections for American democracy. That is why I think this bill and this discussion are so very important.

We know from the Mueller report that 126 million Americans were contacted, either directly or indirectly, just on Facebook by the Russians. We also know the outcome of the Presidential election was based on less than 80,000 votes in three key States in the electoral college. We know that Mr. Mueller said that this was a systematic attempt by the Russians. And we know also that the President's appointed FBI director has said recently, “Russia attempted to interfere with the last election and continues to engage in malign influence operations to this day. This is a threat we need to take extremely seriously and to tackle and respond to with fierce determination and focus.”

Mr. Chairman, we also have talked a lot, in the last few years, about the role of the Federal Government, State governments, and local communities, and I agree with how diffused our historic relationships are. But here is an instance in my amendment. It is a simple one. It is to give the States and local jurisdictions the information they need to be aware of some of these influences that are afforded by this bill.

My amendment is very simple. It requires that when the FEC is made

aware of credible targeted disinformation campaigns, that affected States must be notified within 30 days. I think that is a fairly simple amendment. I would hope, in the spirit of bipartisanship, my colleagues would agree with that.

Thomas Jefferson famously said that, “We in America do not have government by the majority. We have government by the majority who participate.”

We know that disinformation hurts participation when done effectively, as it was just a short time ago in the recent Presidential election. And we also know that effective oversight and this government's engagement of both parties at the Federal level, the State level, and the local level, when we are open, honest, and afford transparency to American voters, they will participate at a higher rate and also at a more knowledgeable rate.

It is our responsibility to recognize that disinformation is a threat to the participation that is vital to our continued success as a democracy, and it is our responsibility to act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this simple amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the core function of the Federal Election Commission is to be the independent regulatory agency charged with administering and enforcing Federal campaign finance law. The FEC has jurisdiction over the financing of campaigns for the U.S. House, the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency.

We do think States should be notified of disinformation by foreign actors. The FEC is not equipped to investigate, much less make a final determination, that foreign nationals have meddled in an election. This is better left to law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

In one way that they are not equipped is that FEC commissioners do not have the authority to obtain clearances to access certain classified information, which would make it impossible for any commissioner or the FEC to make such a notification to States, not to mention the fact that the FEC chair is too busy attacking the President to spend time on additional notification requirements.

It is also worth noting that the majority of the committee's position has been that the FEC is dysfunctional, even to the point that they voted to make it a five-member partisan commission in H.R. 1.

The Department of Justice, FBI, DHS, and other national security agencies are better suited to address the problem of foreign meddling in our elections, which is exactly what we allow them to do in the Honest Elections Act—my bill—that I would certainly hope some on the other side of the aisle would cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from Illinois’ baseball metaphor earlier, and I would say that for this metaphor, I disagree. I think his call is wrong.

I think this amendment is a simple strike. As he knows, the bill requires other agencies to give the information to the FEC. They are merely a collector, in many instances, of the information, so they are the appropriate body to disseminate that information.

That is what my amendment does. I don’t disagree or think that it is appropriate to debate the gentleman’s other aspects, which may be true or not, based on his perspective. The amendment is basically consistent with the bill that the information goes here, and it should be disseminated to the States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from California offering an amendment and participating in this process. It is not every time that we have disagreements on not only legislation, but amendments like this.

I believe that this amendment needs to be clarified before it should be put into law. And just as with the SHIELD Act, I believe it should go back to the drawing board and we ought to be able to have more hearings to find out the effect on free speech in the United States of America, but also give us a chance in a bipartisan way to question the social media platforms that we want to work with us to protect this Nation from foreign meddling.

For the reasons I mentioned above and for the reasons that I stated just now, I am going to urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 313 (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4617, which would strike from the bill a section that gives the U.S. Attorney General unprecedented power to involve

him or herself in State and local elections. This should be a concern for all Americans as it says Washington knows best when it comes to our local elections.

Not only does this section represent a massive Federal overreach, it is also vague.

For example, the section requires the Attorney General to determine whether State and local election officials have taken “adequate steps” to communicate information to address misinformation.

What are adequate steps? It doesn’t say.

What is misinformation? This bill turns the United States Attorney General into a fact-checker.

This section also requires the Attorney General to communicate to the public “by any means” to address misinformation.

Taken together, this language would grant the United States Attorney General power without guardrails and we, as Congress, should find this concerning.

In addition to the troublesome substance of this section, it also arrived on the floor through a deficient process.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have an interest in ensuring legislation under my committee’s jurisdiction is considered in the Judiciary Committee. This did not happen here.

Despite the request from Judiciary Committee Ranking Member COLLINS, this section of the legislation was not afforded the opportunity of a markup by the Judiciary Committee, despite it having jurisdiction. In fact, this is at least the fourth piece of legislation this year that Ranking Member COLLINS requested to markup but was denied an opportunity by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Because this section is a Federal intrusion into State and local elections and came to the floor through a deficient process, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strike this section, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I think the amendment strikes what is really a commonsense section of the underlying bill.

Section 313, beginning on page 49, line 11, comes from the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act. It first gives deference to State and local officials to combat deceptive practices in their localities if there is a credible report made that materially false information has been communicated to the public regarding Federal elections such as the time, place, or manner of holding an election.

Section 313 provides that the responsibility first falls on State and local of-

ficials to correct the materially false information. It is only if State and local election officials fall short of making a correction that the Attorney General would ensure that voters do not fall victim to deceptive practices.

I don’t believe this is an example of Federal interference or overreach. It is an example of putting to use all levels of government to protect voters in our democracy.

Let’s be clear, section 313 is, at its core, about enhancing transparency and disclosure. The sort of activity we are talking about here is merely providing factual information to voters to ensure they are not deceived, that they are adequately informed, and that they have a fair chance of participating in their democracy.

Section 313, page 51, directs the U.S. Attorney General to work in partnership with the Election Assistance Commission, State and local officials, and others to come up with procedures and standards for how to take corrective action if there is an instance of materially false information regarding voting. It is not just whatever he or she thinks at the time. This is going to be said in advance.

The procedures in the partnership determines exactly how the AG could step in when there is materially false information being spread. The information communicated by the AG also should be designed not to favor or disfavor any particular candidate, organization, or political party.

I think this is an example of how local, State, and Federal levels of government could work together to protect voters in our democracy. This is not an academic issue. We have seen situations where online, or elsewhere, information has been spread to people that certain people—for example, one party or the other—would be allowed to vote on a day that wasn’t election day. Well, that needs to be corrected or people will be disenfranchised if they believe it because they saw it on the internet.

Mr. Chairman, I think, though I am sure well-intended, this amendment is a mistake. I urge its defeat, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my good friend.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very well-intended amendment. I agree with my colleague from California that it is a very well-intended amendment that is going to actually correct, I believe, what would be an unintended consequence if this bill were to ever become law.

□ 1600

This section that is being amended today provides unprecedented power to the Attorney General to intercede in Federal races when he or she believes State and local officials have not taken



“adequate steps” to correct “misinformation.”

Madam Chair, the Attorney General is a partisan official. They are not a nonpartisan official. Imagine if Attorney General Barr was given broad authority to take “adequate steps.” This is the language in the bill.

These are the facts, Madam Chair. If Attorney General Barr was given broad authority to take adequate steps in correcting the record in any Democratic districts, imagine that. Imagine the uproar. There would be a public uproar. The same could be said for a Democratic Attorney General.

The section not only gives broad authority to the AG, but it is extremely vague and will also leave State and local election officials struggling to comply with this section.

To make matters worse, we have not heard from a single State or local election official about how this might impact their ability to conduct elections. This is the reason why we have hearings. This is the reason why we call people into Congress to listen to them about the impact of legislation that we are debating in this House.

And we did not have a single hearing before this bill was rushed to the floor. This is not regular order. This is not what the Democratic majority promised when they were given the majority by the American people to run this institution. This is a broken promise that they made to the American people, and I think we need to pass this amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would note that this bill is supported by a broad spectrum of civil rights groups, including the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, as well as the Brennan Center for Justice. And there is a reason for that.

A lot of the mischief that goes on to try and prevent people from voting has a racial impact. We have seen the suppression of the vote, the efforts that have been undertaken to suppress the vote through confusion and through lies, where a piece of information would go into a minority community—“the vote is now on Wednesday, not on Tuesday”—so that people will be confused and not show up to vote.

That is simply wrong. We need to take steps that are reasonable, as this is, to confront that.

This bill will help. That is why so many groups support it.

I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, I agree that it is wrong if somebody pulls out false information about an election, like the date or time, but I certainly don't agree that the United States Attorney General should get involved in local elections.

On this bill and other bills, I think there is a fundamental difference between the way some of my Democratic colleagues believe and what fellow Republicans and I believe. They believe

the U.S. Government should know everything and should do everything. I think local control is better, that they know better what is going on.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. DEGETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 54, insert after line 14 the following:

**Subtitle C—Prohibiting Use of Deepfakes in Election Campaigns**

**SEC. 321. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.), as amended by section 203, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 325. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), a person, political committee, or other entity shall not, within 60 days of a election for Federal office at which a candidate for elective office will appear on the ballot, distribute, with actual malice, materially deceptive audio or visual media of the candidate with the intent to injure the candidate's reputation or to deceive a voter into voting for or against the candidate.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—

“(1) REQUIRED LANGUAGE.—The prohibition in subsection (a) does not apply if the audio or visual media includes—

“(A) a disclosure stating: ‘This \_\_\_\_\_ has been manipulated.’; and

“(B) filled in the blank in the disclosure under subparagraph (A), the term ‘image’, ‘video’, or ‘audio’, as most accurately describes the media.

“(2) VISUAL MEDIA.—For visual media, the text of the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer and no smaller than the largest font size of other text appearing in the visual media. If the visual media does not include any other text, the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer. For visual media that is video, the disclosure shall appear for the duration of the video.

“(3) AUDIO-ONLY MEDIA.—If the media consists of audio only, the disclosure shall be read in a clearly spoken manner and in a pitch that can be easily heard by the average listener, at the beginning of the audio, at the end of the audio, and, if the audio is greater than two minutes in length, interspersed

within the audio at intervals of not greater than two minutes each.

“(c) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN ENTITIES.—This section does not apply to the following:

“(1) A radio or television broadcasting station, including a cable or satellite television operator, programmer, or producer, that broadcasts materially deceptive audio or visual media prohibited by this section as part of a bona fide newscast, news interview, news documentary, or on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events, if the broadcast clearly acknowledges through content or a disclosure, in a manner that can be easily heard or read by the average listener or viewer, that there are questions about the authenticity of the materially deceptive audio or visual media.

“(2) A radio or television broadcasting station, including a cable or satellite television operator, programmer, or producer, when it is paid to broadcast materially deceptive audio or visual media.

“(3) An internet website, or a regularly published newspaper, magazine, or other periodical of general circulation, including an internet or electronic publication, that routinely carries news and commentary of general interest, and that publishes materially deceptive audio or visual media prohibited by this section, if the publication clearly states that the materially deceptive audio or visual media does not accurately represent the speech or conduct of the candidate.

“(4) Materially deceptive audio or visual media that constitutes satire or parody.

“(d) CIVIL ACTION.—

“(1) INJUNCTIVE OR OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF.—A candidate for elective office whose voice or likeness appears in a materially deceptive audio or visual media distributed in violation of this section may seek injunctive or other equitable relief prohibiting the distribution of audio or visual media in violation of this section. An action under this paragraph shall be entitled to precedence in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(2) DAMAGES.—A candidate for elective office whose voice or likeness appears in a materially deceptive audio or visual media distributed in violation of this section may bring an action for general or special damages against the person, committee, or other entity that distributed the materially deceptive audio or visual media. The court may also award a prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees and costs. This paragraph shall not be construed to limit or preclude a plaintiff from securing or recovering any other available remedy.

“(3) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In any civil action alleging a violation of this section, the plaintiff shall bear the burden of establishing the violation through clear and convincing evidence.

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to alter or negate any rights, obligations, or immunities of an interactive service provider under section 230 of title 47, United States Code.

“(f) MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL MEDIA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘materially deceptive audio or visual media’ means an image or an audio or video recording of a candidate's appearance, speech, or conduct that has been intentionally manipulated in a manner such that both of the following conditions are met:

“(1) The image or audio or video recording would falsely appear to a reasonable person to be authentic.

“(2) The image or audio or video recording would cause a reasonable person to have a fundamentally different understanding or impression of the expressive content of the image or audio or video recording than that



person would have if the person were hearing or seeing the unaltered, original version of the image or audio or video recording.”.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)), as amended by section 103, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of section 325 shall be fined not more than \$100,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.”.

(c) EFFECT ON DEFAMATION ACTION.—For purposes of an action for defamation, a violation of section 325 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a), shall constitute defamation per se.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I thank Ms. LOFGREN for her leadership and her courage and hard work in bringing this important bill to the floor.

My amendment to H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act, would generally prohibit the use of so-called deepfakes within 60 days of a Federal election.

These digital photo, audio, and video forgeries are generated using artificial intelligence. They appear realistic and are intended to manipulate or deceive their audience.

This amendment also establishes criminal and civil penalties for the malicious use of deepfakes in Federal elections while providing necessary exemptions for broadcasting or publication of deepfake content by news media organizations in satire or parody and other appropriate cases.

As chairman of the National Security Subcommittee of the Oversight and Reform Committee, I can attest to the escalating warnings that we have received from U.S. intelligence community officials and national security experts regarding the use of these deepfake technologies as an emerging tool of foreign election interference.

During our recent hearing to examine election security, government and private-sector panelists testified about the capacity of deepfake technologies to “weaponize” false information on a massive scale. That is because it is already widely accessible, easy to use, low cost, and rapidly evolving.

In reference to the security of the 2020 U.S. Presidential election, FBI Director Christopher Wray has stated that deepfake content is a “topic of great concern,” as Federal intelligence agencies combat the threat of election meddling by foreign adversaries that are intent on developing new ways to perpetuate malign influence operations.

According to the nonpartisan Council on Foreign Relations, deepfakes present “disinformation on steroids” and could easily be deployed to influence an election, spark violence, exacerbate societal divisions, and undermine other democratic institutions.

The Congressional Research Service similarly warns that hostile state actors could release digitally altered videos of government officials or candidates making incendiary comments or engaged in inappropriate behavior to erode public trust, degrade our public discourse, defame particular candidates, and sway elections.

The proliferation of deepfake technologies presents a serious threat to the integrity of U.S. elections, considering that our Nation’s 17 intelligence agencies already determined that our most fundamental democratic process has come under attack by foreign adversaries. With high confidence, the U.S. intelligence community found that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign aimed at the 2016 election that included clandestine intelligence operations and blatant meddling by state-owned agencies, state-funded media outlets, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media trolls. The final report issued by Special Counsel Robert Mueller augmented this assessment.

According to the “2019 Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community,” our adversaries will continue refining their interference capabilities and add new tactics to dramatically alter the threat landscape for 2020 and future elections.

In the interest of enhancing election security, campaign law must adapt to these evolving technologies. A prohibition on the use of deepfakes in Federal elections is a great first step in the right direction.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not necessarily opposed it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this is a problem. Misinformation, false representation, digitally manipulated images, that is a problem.

What we do in this institution, and the political nature of our jobs, I think we have all been victims of videos that try to provide false information. This has to be addressed.

I believe we need to have some hearings on this issue because it is pretty complicated. And we haven’t had a single hearing with any of the platforms, where many of these videos would be published, before this bill was rushed to the floor.

I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that deepfakes present a unique challenge for Congress to address. I would hate to see a potential solution that is being offered by my good friend put on a partisan bill.

An additional problem I see is that I am not aware of any technology that

can identify which images or video are deepfakes. Perhaps the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology should hold a hearing on this issue as well.

In dealing with this issue, Congress needs to appropriately weigh the First Amendment protections afforded to public speech with the dangerous potential of deepfakes to add further damage to our already polarized climate.

This amendment, like many of these amendments, would be better served to pass through regular order and give the American public a chance to learn about these very important and, at times, recent and troubling issues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I do appreciate the gentleman from Illinois’ thoughtful support for this amendment.

I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership again in bringing the SHIELD Act to the floor and working with me on this amendment.

I again urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116–253.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, insert after line 22 the following:  
**SEC. 206. PROHIBITING ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION TO CONCEAL ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

(a) PROHIBITION.—Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§612. Establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals**

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for an owner, officer, attorney, or incorporation agent of a corporation, company, or other entity to establish or use the corporation, company, or other entity with the intent to conceal an activity of a foreign national (as defined in section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121)) prohibited under such section 319.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, fined under this title, or both.”.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 611 the following:

“612. Establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, my bipartisan amendment cracks down on foreign influence in our elections.

I would like to begin by thanking my friend and coauthor of this amendment, Ranking Member MCCAUL, with whom I have the great privilege of serving on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as my colleagues cosponsoring this amendment, especially Representatives ROUDA, SLOTKIN, and SPEIER.

I also thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her inspiring leadership and for working with me on this provision.

I came to Congress to strengthen our democracy, and that is the fundamental purpose of this truly bipartisan amendment that I am proposing today.

Current campaign finance laws prohibit foreign nationals from making campaign contributions or conducting political activity. But because of a loophole, there is no law specifically preventing foreign nationals from setting up a shell corporation or company to hide illegal political activity.

Our bipartisan amendment will nail that loophole shut by prohibiting foreign nationals from funneling money through shell companies to engage in political activity in America.

We must keep our democratic process safe from all bad actors, including foreign actors, and strengthen the integrity of our elections. That is what this amendment does.

Specifically, this amendment will make it a felony for an owner, officer, attorney, or incorporated agent of a corporation, company, or other entity to establish or use the corporation, company, or other entity with the intent to conceal the political activities of foreign actors.

Put simply, passing our amendment will ensure serious consequences for anyone who starts or operates a shell company, or anyone who helps start or operate a shell company, for the purpose of concealing political activities of bad foreign actors.

I am proud to partner with the gentleman from Texas in proposing this bipartisan amendment to defend our elections against foreign interference. Our elections are a sacred cornerstone of our democracy, and we must do everything in our power to protect them.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I am particularly pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA), my good friend.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I thank my friend from Michigan, Representative LEVIN, for yielding.

Madam Chair, preventing foreign election interference is a bipartisan issue. This amendment is proof of that

statement. I am proud to support this amendment, a commonsense measure to close a loophole that is allowing illegal political spending by foreign nationals in United States elections.

In the 2016 election, millions of Americans saw and engaged with political advertisements paid for by foreign nationals. Last year, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg confirmed in sworn testimony before Congress that foreign nationals were purchasing campaign ads and issue ads through American shell companies.

As elected officials, we took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States of America against both foreign and domestic adversaries and threats. That includes the cornerstone of our democracy, free and fair elections.

□ 1615

This amendment and the underlying bill seek to end a dangerous and well-documented form of foreign election interference.

I thank Representatives LEVIN and MCCAUL for offering this important amendment, and I look forward to continuing to work with them to address this critical issue.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I support this amendment.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. LEVIN, Ranking Member MCCAUL, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. SLOTKIN, for offering this very thoughtful amendment. I would like to note that, even though the issue of using shell corporations to make contributions is covered under the existing straw donor prohibition, I do believe more clarity is needed on this issue.

Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleagues. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I will close by thanking the gentleman from Illinois for his kind words on this. We really have worked hard as a team. It is a truly bipartisan effort.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank, again, my good friend from the great State of Michigan for offering this amendment.

The only thing that I wish could have happened is I wish we could have had some hearings on this bill so that we could have brought experts in on shell corporations that are making straw donor donations to Federal campaigns that are already prohibited so we could find out the best way to ensure that doesn't happen in the future, especially from nefarious foreign actors.

Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, insert after line 12 the following:  
**SEC. 118. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON MEDIA LITERACY AND ONLINE POLITICAL CONTENT CONSUMPTION.**

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall commission an independent study and report on media literacy with respect to online political content consumption among voting-age Americans.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study and report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An evaluation of media literacy skills, such as the ability to evaluate sources, synthesize multiple accounts into a coherent understanding of an issue, understand the context of communications, and responsibly create and share information, among voting-age Americans.

(2) An analysis of the effects of media literacy education and particular media literacy skills on the ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising.

(3) Recommendations for improving voting-age Americans' ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the entity conducting the study and report under subsection (a) shall submit the report to the Commission.

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the report under subsection (c), the Commission shall submit the report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, together with such comments on the report as the Commission considers appropriate.

(e) DEFINITION OF MEDIA LITERACY.—The term "media literacy" means the ability to—

(1) access relevant and accurate information through media;

(2) critically analyze media content and the influences of media;

(3) evaluate the comprehensiveness, relevance, credibility, authority, and accuracy of information;

(4) make educated decisions based on information obtained from media and digital sources;

(5) operate various forms of technology and digital tools; and

(6) reflect on how the use of media and technology may affect private and public life.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, it is quite evident that our democracy is under attack from concerted foreign influence campaigns, and online disinformation is one of our enemies' most potent weapons.

Starting in 2013, Russian operatives associated with the Internet Research Agency waged a robust and systematic influence campaign on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter that reached millions of users in the United States.

These operatives used political advertisements and falsified news articles and other content in an attempt to deceive social media users, widen our political and social divisions, and weaken our confidence and participation in the democratic process.

Their efforts, particularly surrounding the 2016 election, were disturbingly successful.

About 60 percent of Americans who prefer getting their news through social media say they have shared false information. Additionally, public confidence in our democracy is low, and we are perhaps more polarized than ever before.

With the 2020 elections right around the corner, we must act now to build up our resilience to these efforts and ensure Americans are informed, critical consumers of online content. Voters must view online political advertising with a discerning eye and be able to make educated decisions based on the content that they consume.

This amendment, Madam Chair, to the SHIELD Act would direct the FEC to commission a study on Americans' media literacy skills, including the ability to critically evaluate sources and responsibly share information. It would require a report on the impact of media literacy education on how Americans consume and understand online political content, with a focus on political advertisements. The study would also include recommendations to improve voters' resilience to disinformation.

A functioning democracy depends on informed citizens who can responsibly participate in the political process, and the unquestioning consumption and sharing of disinformation online undermines the integrity of this system. My amendment will help shed light on the skills Americans need to resist these malicious campaigns.

Renee Hobbs, the director of Media Education Lab in Rhode Island and a professor at the University of Rhode Island, puts it plainly:

"Learning to recognize and resist propaganda and disinformation is an essential dimension of education in a digital age. After all, it is the only long-term strategy that embodies our country's vital democratic traditions of robust dialogue and debate in the marketplace of ideas."

Professor Hobbs is right, and as more and more Americans rely on social media to get their news, media literacy is becoming ever more important.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so we can explore how best to build up our citizens' resilience to foreign online influence campaigns.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, for offering this amendment. As good a friend as he is, it somewhat pains me to have to stand up and be opposed to it.

Again, the FEC, the Federal Election Commission, is the independent regulatory agency charged with administering and enforcing the Federal campaign finance law. They have jurisdiction over the financing of campaigns for us here in the House, our colleagues in the Senate, the President, and the Vice President. They are not the fake news police, much to the chagrin of the current FEC Chair.

This amendment requires an independent report from the FEC, and I am not convinced that the FEC Chair is capable of issuing any independent report, any independent guidance, or any independent legal interpretations; and, frankly, I don't think she is capable of offering any independent tweets.

I think it is worth noting that every single House Democrat voted to make the FEC a partisan agency earlier this Congress in H.R. 1 and has lamented how dysfunctional they believe the FEC is. If the FEC were a partisan agency, would we want them determining which news was fake news and which news was legitimate?

I agree we need to understand and improve media literacy with respect to political content in this country, but the FEC is not the entity to lead that endeavor.

Let's take a look at the danger of overregulating online ads and misinterpreting political content. The ad I have behind me and the ones behind it are already being labeled as political ads on Facebook. These came straight from the Facebook ad library.

First off, we have my favorite. As the proud dad of two Yorkies at home in Taylorville, Illinois, this political ad for hotdogcollars.com would allow me to get my two Yorkies some new dog collars. I don't know—except maybe the American flag dog collar—how political that is.

Next up is the very political ad Facebook is now categorizing under current law and under their current regulations as a political ad—Pizza Crave. Hey, it is Halloween season, it is almost upon us, \$10 pizza pies. I don't know why that is categorized as political, but it is.

Do we really want the FEC to figure out that they are the agency to correct that? No. Facebook ought to correct it.

Lastly, Stone Bridge Pizza & Salad: We always crave the classic—obviously a political ad. I don't know anybody who would eat pizza like that, but clearly this is not a political ad.

I think we need to take a step back. We need to realize that the current FEC that is dysfunctional is the last place for independent review of anything. We need to make sure that the FEC does its job in a nonpartisan way.

Madam Chair, we need to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, if only my colleague had actually read and understood the bill, he would know that it is an independent study. I think that would make a difference in how, perhaps, he felt about the bill.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN).

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to the SHIELD Act, the digital citizenship and media literacy amendment.

We have said it before. No matter who we are, Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, we should all agree that we don't want foreigners manipulating our citizens, sowing discord in our society, and playing in our political process.

We know that foreign entities continue to target social media ads and disinformation at voters, particularly in swing States like mine, Michigan. These ads are horrible. They seek to divide us and influence our political process.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a bipartisan report late last month and said that the public needs to be informed and both understand and identify disinformation that is critical to preventing foreign influence. This means our citizens, and especially our kids, need to have the tools to spot this disinformation.

In this new age of digital warfare, we need education. Education is critical. This study helps us get at this so that we can all understand how to identify propaganda and flag it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments from my good friend from Michigan. I, too, am in a swing district. We don't want misinformation.

To address comments made by my good friend from Rhode Island, I understand that what the gentleman is asking for is an independent report. I don't believe the FEC can offer an independent assessment of anything right now.

Madam Chair, you have an FEC that is completely dysfunctional. You have a Chair of the FEC who is doing nothing but taking partisan shots at our

President. That is not what the FEC should be.

The FEC is incapable of offering any independent review of anything. That is my concern. That is why I believe if we could work together and come up with a more viable solution to get a true independent study, I think we could do that.

Madam Chair, I am ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Chair, to address my colleague's point, again, it is not the FEC that is going to do the study. It is an independent study that will be done, be commissioned to be concluded, and that would be the final product, not the FEC.

So, with that, Russia's election interference efforts in 2016 were sweeping and damaging, and we know that social media was one of their greatest weapons. As the 2020 elections approach, and for future elections, we must ensure that our citizens are resilient to foreign influence companies by arming them with the skills to be critical consumers of online political content.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to study media literacy and its impact on American voters—again, an independent study that will be commissioned.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, to clarify, I don't think the FEC is capable of actually commissioning an independent study. I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Rhode Island to find another agency that we believe could offer a fair assessment.

Madam Chair, I will urge a "no" vote on this amendment for those reasons, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 6, made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 15, insert "and each immediate family member of a candidate" after "each candidate".

Page 4, line 9, insert "an immediate family member of the candidate," after "a candidate,".

Page 7, line 9, strike the closing quotation mark and the second period.

Page 7, insert after line 9 the following:

"(4) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—In this subsection, the term 'immediate family member' means, with respect to a candidate, a parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the underlying bill and my amendment, which would include a candidate's immediate family members to those whose direct or indirect contacts or communications with a foreign national may amount to a reportable foreign contact.

I also think it is very fitting that we are doing this legislation in the same week that we will honor Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman, Elijah Cummings, someone who I have had the privilege of not only working with but being represented by when I was a law student in Baltimore.

But Elijah, the gentleman from Maryland, and I worked to write the Protecting Our Democracy Act immediately after the Russian interference campaign.

Every member of the Democrat Caucus and members from the Republican Caucus signed on to that. I still believe that is the best way to address what the Russians did in 2016 and to harden our systems so they don't do it again.

But I believe that this effort, the SHIELD Act, led by Chairwoman ZOE LOFGREN will go a very, very long way in protecting our elections, and I thank the chairwoman for her leadership in this effort.

American elections should be decided by Americans. Ms. LOFGREN's bill will go a long way to stopping secret foreign attempts to influence our democracy, as we saw in 2016.

We know that as a part of Russia's attack on us, it purchased social media advertisements.

Madam Chair, 3,500 advertisements on political or public policy topics were purchased using rubles. To combat this conduct, I had introduced in May, H.R. 2853, the Corporate Duty to Report Act. Part of my bill would require companies distributing political communications, including social media companies, to take the small but important step in at least asking if the purchaser is a foreign national. I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for including this concept in the SHIELD Act.

We also learned in June 2016 that Donald Trump, Jr., was told over email that the Russian Government was offering "official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary and her dealings with Russia," which was, "part of Russia and its government support for Mr. Trump."

Don Jr., replied in part, "If it's what you say, I love it, especially later in

the summer." Then he accepted the offer of assistance. He told a lot of people about the offer, including his brother-in-law and the chairman of the campaign, he had a meeting around the offer, but he never told law enforcement.

This is the part of the honor code that most candidates in America follow. It is just the right thing to do. Unfortunately, Donald Trump, Jr.'s conduct highlights that we have to take parts of the honor code that good people usually just follow and codify them into law.

I wrote the Duty to Report Act last Congress with Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, who sponsored it in the Senate, that also would include immediate family members, not just the candidate to tell law enforcement, but the parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling.

I am afraid that someone like Don Jr., who didn't have an official role in the Trump campaign, would not be included in the SHIELD Act as written, and that is the reason I am offering this amendment.

Madam Chair, I ask for support on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this amendment amends the underlying duty to report section.

The goal of this underlying section is something I share with my friend across the aisle. If a foreign national would approach me with an offer of assistance in my campaign, I would absolutely alert the FBI.

My colleague from California mentions an instance with the President's son. I mean, clearly, I know that he and my Democratic colleagues, they look at this, this is not about what is going to happen to many of the colleagues here, because, likely, we are never going to be approached by a foreign national. But if we are, I think we all agree, it is a pretty bipartisan consensus, we would call the FBI.

This is a partisan attack on the President. But rarely are instances as blatant as what I mentioned before about being contacted and I would call the FBI. What this underlying section is asking of political committees is for them to serve as immigration officials, where they will be in a position to determine the citizenship of anyone that their campaign comes into contact with.

But, again, I believe through bipartisan negotiations, we could make this work. The underlying duty to report section was already vague to begin with, and adding in additional parties, as this amendment does, that must comply only adds to our concern that we are setting up campaign committees, as well as their families, we are setting them up for failure.

It is also worth noting that this amendment would affect family members the candidate has no control over. My family members own fast food restaurants. So are they going to have to ask—if this becomes law—every customer if they are a foreign national representing a foreign government?

Do they have a duty to report?

That is something that needs to be clarified.

We have to do a little bit more work. I think we can work this out, but again, the secretive nature of how this bill was written and forced onto the floor with zero hearings doesn't give us a chance, or frankly, the majority a chance to ask these questions and address our concerns.

Madam Chair, I would urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman's concerns and I accept that the gentleman would report, if he was contacted by a foreign national. And I want to clarify, in the legislation under section (c)(1), the term is covered, "foreign national," which means a foreign principal who would fall subject to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. So it is not an immigrant. It is not any person born outside the United States. It is someone acting on behalf of a foreign agent.

And it also has a "knowing standard," meaning that you would have to have some knowledge that this person is acting on behalf of a foreign agent. And the Donald Trump, Jr., example, it was represented that the individuals were working with the prosecutor general of Russia, so clearly, that would be notice that this is on behalf of a foreign agent.

Now, I also want to just point out that, yes, there is an honor code that we all follow, and I believe most of my colleagues would tell the FBI. And, of course, in 2000, when the Gore campaign received debate prep materials for the Bush campaign, the Gore campaign went to the FBI because it was provided by a foreign national.

However, what we learned in 2016 is not everyone is as honorable, and so we have to codify this. And I do believe that we will be judged by what we do as our democracy has been tested. And not only what we do, but what we learn from the vulnerabilities that have been exposed.

And that is why I think it is so important that Ms. LOFGREN's legislation is voted for and passed on this floor, and that we include this amendment to make sure it is not just candidates, but also the family members.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I agree with my colleague from California. We will be judged on how we actually impact foreign interference in our elections. We

will be judged on the chilling effect to free speech that this legislation, if put into law, would have on our system that is so much different from those nefarious countries and leaders who want to meddle in our election process.

But my point earlier still stands. I agree that somebody who would fall under FARA, the Foreign Agent Registration Act, would be the ones that we would have a duty to report, if they came to our campaign. But at the same time, how do we know? Are they going to wear a badge that says, Hey, I am a FARA-registered individual from another country, and I am coming to talk to you since you are a Member of Congress in a political campaign?

I mean, am I going to have my kids who are in college, am I going to have to have them ask everyone they come into contact with, "Are you registered under the Foreign Agent Registration Act in Washington, D.C., because I have a duty to report?"

How are we going to know? That is why we have to take a step back. We have to sit down. We have to work this together. There are too many unintended consequences that, yes, Madam Chair, we will be judged by in this country. We will be judged by the freedoms and the freedom of speech that many in this country take for granted, that we should stand together, Republicans and Democrats, to protect, or we will be judged by bad legislation that could be turned into law that could have a chilling effect on these freedoms, on these liberties that our adversaries that meddle in our elections want to use to take them away from every single American.

Vote "no" on this amendment. Vote to protect free speech and vote to take a step back to clarify how we work to ensure that no foreign entity can interfere with our elections again.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after "foreign contact," the following: "The Federal Bureau of Investigation, not later than 1 week after receiving a notification from a political committee under this paragraph, shall submit to the political committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate written or electronic confirmation of receipt of the notification."

Page 11, insert after line 23 the following (and redesignate the succeeding section):

#### SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report relating to notifications received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 304(j)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 101(a) of this Act).

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following with respect to notifications described in subsection (a):

(1) The number of such notifications received from political committees during the year covered by the report.

(2) A description of protocols and procedures developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation relating to receipt and maintenance of records relating to such notifications.

(3) With respect to such notifications received during the year covered by the report, a description of any subsequent actions taken by the Director resulting from the receipt of such notifications.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "congressional intelligence committees" has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I want to recognize, first, the hard work of Chairwoman LOFGREN. Your hard work and your leadership on this important issue and the underlying bill. It is clear that our foreign adversaries have and will continue to interfere and influence our elections and attempt to erode confidence in our government and destroy our democratic system.

The Mueller report made clear that the Russian Government interfered in the 2016 Presidential election in a sweeping and systematic fashion. And Mr. Mueller testified earlier this year that many more countries have developed misinformation campaigns since 2016 targeted at the United States, our democracy, and our system of elections.

Facebook on Monday disclosed that it had taken down four new foreign interference operations originating from Iran and Russia. Soliciting or accepting foreign interference doesn't just violate our democratic norms; it clearly violates our laws.

Yet, in June, President Trump said there would be nothing wrong with accepting from a foreign government incriminating information about an opponent and saw no reason—the President saw no reason—to call the FBI if it were to happen.

He went one step further and said it was wrong for FBI Director Chris Wray to say that public officials or campaigns should contact the FBI if they

are contacted by other nations seeking to influence or interfere with our elections.

The President's remarks mirrored one given by his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, who also said he was not sure he would call the FBI if a foreign government offered damaging information about a political foe.

That is why it is critical that we pass this legislation, to protect the integrity of our elections.

The underlying bill requires public officials, candidates, and campaigns to report to the FBI when foreign governments and their agents contact them and holds them responsible when they fail to report.

Madam Chair, my amendment strengthens this legislation by requiring the FBI to confirm receipt of any notification of possible foreign interference operations.

Additionally, the FBI must also notify both the House and Senate Intelligence Committees guaranteeing that Congress, as a coequal branch of government, is made aware when foreign agents and hostile nations are attempting to undermine our democracy.

Finally, my amendment would require the FBI to submit an annual report to Congress related to all the notifications it has received and the corresponding actions the Bureau has taken in response.

The FBI cannot be passive to these threats to our national security but must take decisive action to respond to election interference.

Madam Chair, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and this underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, the provision this section seeks to amend has problems in and of itself. I object to this amendment because I object to the underlying premise of the bill. It is unreasonable to require candidates to vet every foreign national they come into contact with.

I understand that this bill requires that candidates know or have reason to know that foreign nationals are covered. My question is: Would not any government employee, such as those that work at an embassy, be covered under this bill? Wouldn't a conversation with a traffic officer or embassy clerk be subject to penalties under this section?

I absolutely believe that campaigns should have to report offers of assistance from foreign nationals. The issue with this bill and, thus, this amendment, is that it is overbroad and puts the responsibility on campaigns. Campaigns are ill-prepared to interpret this language.

I am also concerned that requiring the FBI to not only notify Congress,

but detail how they are managing and responding to notifications from political committees will inevitably lead to selective leaks and will politicize the well-intended goal of preventing foreign influence.

Madam Chair, for those reasons, I oppose this bill. And since my colleague yielded back, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment to the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 7, strike "and"

Page 33, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

"(2) an analysis of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among rural communities and the success or failure of these efforts, together with recommendations to address these efforts in future elections; and"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1645

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of my amendment to the SHIELD Act, which is meant to keep foreign influences from depressing voter turnout in rural communities.

Protecting our democracy and upholding the sanctity of our elections is of critical importance.

Madam Chair, the SHIELD Act is urgently needed legislation. Americans will go to the polls in a matter of weeks, and every day, we are presented with more data that our foreign adversaries are working to influence our elections and undermine our democracy.

These destructive tactics, as we have seen in previous election cycles, continue to get more sophisticated, with outside parties now manipulating our elections through the ballot box, social media, and spreading misinformation.

My amendment fights against these tactics and requires an analysis, following each Federal election, into whether or not illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation or propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among rural communities.

The amendment also requires a breakdown of the successes or failures

of these efforts and recommendations for how we can address these tactics in future elections.

Americans in rural communities face many hurdles to exercising the right to vote, including the distance to the nearest poll. We cannot add additional hurdles of foreign disinformation and its influence on voter turnout.

There is nothing more important than protecting our democracy and ensuring every American has the ability to vote and the opportunity to make their voices heard.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I, too, like my colleague from New York, represent a district with a very large rural population. I want to see rural turnout as high as possible.

But the mission of the FEC is to administer and enforce Federal campaign finance law. I mean, if this becomes law, along with some of the other previous amendments and amendments after this, I don't know when the FEC is going to have any time to actually enforce campaign finance violations that are happening right now. The FEC is not equipped to receive all these mandates from Congress.

This is an extremely important job, a job some on the Commission, including the Chair, are ignoring by spending all their time attacking the President. I think we need to let the FEC focus on their day job.

There are many groups, within and outside government, that could produce a report on misinformation, such as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, maybe even the Brennan Center. Let's let them do it.

Help us help the FEC to be able to do the job that we have required it to do.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I would note to my friend that in order for the FEC to enforce the law as you suggest, which I certainly believe they ought to, it would help if they would have the data and the information to do so and to be able to track down attempts to break the law.

This would be exactly what we are trying to do with this amendment. To speculate on who might—when, where, and how—be able to do this is a waste of time when we know at this point that we are under siege.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I look forward to working with my colleague from New York to address many issues regarding rural America. I would love to be able to sit down and find a workable solution.



The problem is, the solution that is being offered in this amendment is going to be tacked on to a bill that is never going to become law. So we are either going to talk about amendments that are going to remain talking points or we can sit down together and work in a bipartisan fashion to get a law passed that is going to have the impact that my colleague from New York and I want it to have.

Let's sit down, without having to write the rules that the FEC would have to follow. Let's work together and send a letter to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Let's send a letter to the Brennan Center and see if they can study it.

Why do we have to wait so long? This is a much easier way to address the problem that I think he and I agree ought to be addressed. Let's do that.

When this bill passes on a partisan rollcall today and goes nowhere when it moves into the Senate, let's commit to working together to see what we can do to get this done because rural America is too important to be affected by partisanship here in Washington, D.C.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I would be more than happy to work with my colleague to do whatever we can to deal with protecting our elections and ensuring that they remain free and fair.

As I am sure the gentleman understands, representing a rural district, too many folks in our communities are being left behind, and they should not be left behind in the least bit when it comes to the sanctity of our elections.

While we might be in a position where, unfortunately, partisanship gets in the way of these issues, I will note that to simply say these things won't become law is part of the problem. I think it is also important to deconstruct why these things are not making their way into law in the first place.

When people become overly partisan in this environment, we are at an impasse, unfortunately. I am here to work beyond that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, again, I agree with my colleague. This place becomes overly partisan. This entire process, this bill, with zero hearings in the House Administration Committee before it was forced to markup through our committee, without us to have a chance to ask experts what they can and cannot do to address many of the problems that my colleague from New York actually offers solutions for, that is the problem of partisanship.

We can't just blame the Senate. I was told by many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when we were in the majority, "So what if the Senate is not going to pass it? We ought to work together in the House." I agreed then, and I agree now. We ought to find solutions.

Unfortunately, partisanship has overtaken this process. The unfortunate result of that is that good ideas like the one my colleague has are going to stop in their tracks when this amendment passes on a partisan rollcall vote for this amendment, and then it is not going to be signed into law.

Again, I can't wait to work with my colleague on finding a way to get this information into the right hands and have those who can study it without having to go through a dysfunctional Federal Election Commission and also have them study why we had historic turnout not just in urban America but in rural America during the 2018 midterms. Let's talk about what we have done right to make sure that voters have a chance to get to the polls at historic turnout numbers like we saw during the 2018 election cycle, which allowed many of my colleagues to get elected to this institution.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. I look forward to working with my colleague in the future to address the problem of access and voter access in rural America, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I would like to note, to bring the discussion back full circle, when my friend says that the FEC is dysfunctional but began this conversation saying that it has the responsibility to enforce election laws, those two points don't really go hand in hand.

I think it is important that if we are going to make the FEC able and capable of enforcing the laws that we know are critical to protecting our democracy, then we should operate on the assumption of how we could make the FEC as functional as possible and give the FEC data and information to achieve its stated purpose.

I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership on this issue and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put the protection of our democracy over partisan division and pass both my amendment and the underlying bill.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 40, insert after line 6 the following:

**SEC. 303. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE RELATING TO CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121), as amended by section 117, section 201(a), section 201(b), and section 301, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting "; or"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) a person to knowingly provide substantial assistance to another person in carrying out an activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(f) KNOWINGLY DESCRIBED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(4), the term 'knowingly' means actual knowledge, constructive knowledge, awareness of pertinent facts that would lead a reasonable person to conclude there is a substantial probability, or awareness of pertinent facts that would lead a reasonable person to conduct a reasonable inquiry to establish—

"(A) with respect to an activity described in subsection (a)(1), that the contribution, donation, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement is from a foreign national;

"(B) with respect to an activity described in subsection (a)(2), that the contribution or donation solicited, accepted, or received is from a foreign national; and

"(C) with respect to an activity described in subsection (a)(3), that the person directing, dictating, controlling, or directly or indirectly participating in the decision making process is a foreign national.

"(2) PERTINENT FACTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), pertinent facts include, but are not limited to, that the person making the contribution, donation, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement, or that the person from whom the contribution or donation is solicited, accepted, or received, or that the person directing, dictating, controlling, or directly or indirectly participating in the decision making process—

"(A) uses a foreign passport or passport number for identification purposes;

"(B) provides a foreign address;

"(C) uses a check or other written instrument drawn on a foreign bank, or by a wire transfer from a foreign bank, in carrying out the activity; or

"(D) resides abroad.

"(g) SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term 'substantial assistance' means, with respect to an activity prohibited by paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a), involvement with an intent to facilitate successful completion of the activity."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN today for having supported such an amazing body of work and for also supporting this amendment.

I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 4617, which helps secure our elections by holding Americans who help foreigners funnel money into our elections more accountable.

Throughout our history, people have fought for the right to vote, and our men and women in uniform have died to protect that right. Being an American is a privilege, and the right for

every American to cast their ballot is sacred. It is part of our duty, and it is part of our duty in Congress, to protect that right. That is why I am encouraging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment.

Foreign money in our elections is an assault on the American electorate and on the democracy that our forefathers built. Americans who help foreign actors meddle in our elections must be held accountable under the law.

To vote against my amendment is, therefore, to condone the actions of Americans who act against the interests of our country and who help foreigners undermine our elections.

I believe I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say this body is committed to defending our country's democratic processes. This need not be partisan because there is nothing more fundamentally American than protecting our most sacred right, the right to vote, from all foreign interference.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from the great State of Pennsylvania for offering this amendment.

However, I would like to add, this is an incredibly wonky amendment to an already complicated, convoluted, and confusing bill. I don't think you should have to be a high-powered campaign finance attorney to understand what is at stake in terms of election security.

The issue of foreign nationals meddling in elections can be resolved more simply by passing my bill, the Honest Elections Act. My bill does not have to empower the FEC, an already—I have said, and I hope my colleagues agree—pretty dysfunctional agency.

If they didn't believe it was dysfunctional, they wouldn't have voted, in H.R. 1, to make it a partisan agency. If they think it is great now, why did they try to make it into an even more partisan agency?

So, I think we all agree it is dysfunctional. We may have different reasons why.

But my bill doesn't empower a dysfunctional FEC to address the problem of foreign nationals meddling in our elections. My bill empowers the Department of Justice, which has jurisdiction over enforcing the Foreign Agents Registration Act. That is a better option.

Clearly, I am not going to get an option because this bill was brought to the floor without any hearings, without any opportunity for us to have input, and that is a problem. That is a problem with legislating in this institution.

That is a broken promise that this Democratic majority made to the voters who sent them here and put them in the majority. They said they were going to do things differently, right? I heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in my terms before this one, how things were ramrodded through, how regular order wasn't followed, how they weren't given a chance to sit down and come up with solutions. Well, I find it ironic that the success story we have of the Republican majority in the 115th Congress of investing \$380 million in election security funds, where we saw historic turnout in the 2018 midterms—we saw historic turnout, and we saw success.

That is what a Republican majority gave. The Democrat majority, they have given us hearings—well, wait, no. No hearings before this bill was put to the floor, that is a problem.

I really want to say thank you to my colleague from Pennsylvania for offering this amendment. It is a common-sense amendment. But, again, the FEC is not the place. I am not going to be opposed to this amendment. The DOJ is the place.

Madam Chair, I am going to make sure I reserve my time. If I had a challenge flag, I thought my colleague last time yielded back, but I believe the judgment from the referees up there was that he did not yield back. Maybe we could check the replay a little later, so I will go ahead and reserve this time.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Chair, I will take it as the deepest compliment from my colleague, Mr. DAVIS, that he says that my amendment is wonky since I believe that is our responsibility here in Congress, to legislate and to develop good policy.

I will also take that back to the working group that was a bipartisan working group that developed this amendment with me, the bipartisan Task Force Sentry, which really worked very hard to find a way to make sure that we would codify what was already being practiced by the FEC.

This doesn't give the FEC any more power. It simply gives the power to us to be able to actually criminalize people by defining what it means to support foreign interference.

I believe that this amendment does speak for itself, and I am very, very grateful for the compliments of how this is a policy wonk's dream. I will go ahead and interpret the gentleman's words.

I very much would encourage Americans to understand why we need to prevent funneling foreign money into our elections.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 54, insert after line 14 the following:

**Subtitle C—Assessment of Exemption of Registration Requirements Under FARA for Registered Lobbyists**

**SEC. 321. ASSESSMENT OF EXEMPTION OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER FARA FOR REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.**

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct and submit to Congress an assessment of the implications of the exemption provided under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) for agents of foreign principals who are also registered lobbyists under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and shall include in the assessment an analysis of the extent to which revisions in such Acts might mitigate the risk of foreign government money influencing elections or political processes in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to the SHIELD Act, which takes a step toward solving a tough, complicated, outstanding challenge in preventing foreign influence in our elections, and that is closing loopholes that currently allow lobbyists of foreign governments to contribute to U.S. campaigns.

Again, no matter who we are or what party we are from, we can all agree that we don't want foreigners playing in our political process.

I am very proud that the SHIELD Act includes legislation—we have discussed it earlier—that closes loopholes so that foreigners cannot buy ads for or against a candidate in an American election. That idea was very simple. Particularly on social media, this is important.

So why, then, if we are not letting foreign entities buy ads in our political process is it okay that lobbyists for foreign governments are able to contribute to candidates, campaigns, and otherwise influence U.S. elections?

There is some work to be done on this. It is, admittedly, complicated. But in order to properly close these loopholes, we need to first understand what those loopholes are and how they impact foreign entities' ability to influence our elections.

My amendment directs the Government Accountability Office to assess

existing law to identify loopholes in FARA, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and then recommend the right legislative fixes.

The SHIELD Act does a great deal to meet the threat of foreign influence and interference with robust legislative responses. This amendment will help us continue that work and get us closer to a solution to an outstanding vulnerability in our system.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am supportive of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I just want to say to my colleague from the great State of Michigan, thank you.

Finally—finally—we have a study that is not too wonky, a perfect amount of wonkiness, that is going to go through an agency that is going to give us an unbiased review: the GAO.

Thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you. Pass this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I am just shocked because I have them running, jumping up and down over there.

I continue to think that the gentleman from Illinois doesn't understand that when he calls our bills wonky and our amendments wonky, we are deeply proud of that over here. I am thrilled that he is supportive.

There actually is a bipartisan agreement on the need to reform FARA, as reflected, I think, by Senator GRASSLEY's bipartisan bill, very similar language.

I am thrilled. I thank the gentleman for his support and for jumping up and down, giving us a little energy.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 41, line 1, strike "60" and insert "90".  
Page 42, line 11, strike "60" and insert "90".

Page 45, line 20, strike "60" and insert "90".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to strengthen protections from deceptive practices in Federal elections.

We know that in the lead-up to the 2016 election, our adversaries employed multiple systematic efforts to spread disinformation and sow confusion among American voters. In one particularly egregious example, Russian bots used social media to mislead voters and tell them that they could "vote from home" by simply texting a code or going online.

On the eve of the 2018 election, Facebook deleted many accounts—including those with links to the Russian Government—that were engaged in coordinated, deceptive behavior.

Today, we know that our adversaries are not only working to hijack our political system just before an election, they are interfering in our democracy on a continuous basis.

Madam Chair, election security is not about Democrats or Republicans. Election security is about all Americans coming together to defend our shared democracy—our democracy—enshrined in our Constitution.

I have prioritized election security since arriving in Washington 10 months ago. As chairwoman of the House Science Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, I held a hearing on disinformation and the threat posed by online imposters and deep fakes.

I have worked with a group of colleagues on both sides of the aisle on election security, and we have heard over and over again from experts on the need for more robust protections to combat this new era of coordinated disinformation efforts.

As a proud Representative of the great State of New Jersey, I will always defend our right as Americans to have a spirited debate, particularly when it comes to what matters to us in the run-up to our elections.

One of the things I love about my district is, while we don't always agree on the path forward, we agree on the need for honest and respectful debate. That is what our democracy is all about. It is what I signed up to defend when I joined the United States Navy.

So it is essential that we stand together as Americans to strengthen our laws and to ensure that our foreign adversaries are not able to dictate the outcomes of our elections.

I offer this amendment to prohibit any attempts to deceive voters 90 days before a Federal primary and general elections. This includes knowingly providing false information about the time or place of voting, what qualifications a voter must have in order to vote, or public endorsements of candidates.

Expanding the provisions in the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act from 60 days before an election to 90 days will better protect our democracy from hostile foreign actors

trying to disrupt the voices and votes of Americans. It also protects against longstanding efforts to disenfranchise communities of color, women, and other marginalized groups.

In my home State of New Jersey, early voting can occur up to 45 days before an election. In fact, 39 States across the country have some form of early voting. That is why we need this critical amendment to extend protections and prohibit disinformation before any American casts their ballot.

I urge my colleagues to pass this important amendment, safeguard our democracy, and ensure that the American people, not our foreign adversaries, determine the results of our elections.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate my new colleague from New Jersey offering this amendment and participating in this process. I look to work with her and many of my colleagues when the majority party finally comes to the table and wants to put a bipartisan solution together.

Everyone here is against deceptive practices. This includes providing false information about the time or place of voting and qualifications for voting.

But the underlying section here presents numerous questions because of its vagueness. Some of the situations this would apply to seem pretty ridiculous.

Do you want to know how ridiculous this section of the SHIELD Act is? Let's talk about public endorsements.

Recently, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said about current Presidential candidate, our colleague, Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD:

I think the Russians have got their eye on somebody and are grooming her to be a third-party candidate. She's a favorite of the Russians.

So Secretary Clinton is suggesting the Russians endorse Congresswoman GABBARD. Is that not a false endorsement? Would Hillary Clinton not be subject to 5 years in prison according to this section if this bill were passed?

Let the RECORD show, nobody is chanting "Lock her up."

This is another ridiculous section of the bill. It is not surprising, given the warp speed with which this bill is being rushed to the floor.

I have to commend my colleague from New Jersey because this amendment is right about the amount of wonkiness that we need in amendments and pieces of legislation.

But I will stand here and say, as a Member of this institution, that we can never get so wonky with our jobs and our writing of bills that it has a chilling effect on the First Amendment

rights to free speech that every American in this country deserves.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 7, strike “and”

Page 33, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

“(2) an analysis of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among African-American and other minority communities and the success or failure of these efforts, together with recommendations to address these efforts in future elections; and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my straightforward, commonsense amendment which would specifically examine how illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among African American and other minority communities and the success or failure of these efforts during our recent elections. This amendment would also call for recommendations to address these concerns in future elections.

Republicans and Democrats agree that foreign adversaries should never be allowed to sow discord in our political system and interfere with our electoral process. Unfortunately, in the last two elections, we saw massive misinformation campaigns launched by hostile foreign powers, and we know—we know—those efforts disproportionately targeted African American communities.

Last May, the House Judiciary Committee released a trove of over 3,500 Facebook ads posted by Russia-linked accounts between 2014 and 2017. In 2015, for instance, Kremlin-backed accounts tweeted and retweeted dozens of messages manipulating the tragic mass shooting at the predominantly African American Mother Emanuel AME Church in downtown Charleston. Ads

like this reached over 11.4 million people.

Russia has sought to influence our democratic process by stoking racial, religious, and political differences, and this has had real consequences. African American turnout declined in 2016 for the Presidential election for the first time in 20 years, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, falling to less than 60 percent, from a record high of 66.6 percent in 2012.

Election security is not a partisan issue; it is essential to our democracy; and Americans deserve to have the confidence of knowing the information they seek hasn't been manipulated by foreign adversaries.

Our next elections are quickly approaching, so the time to show the world that we stand united on election security is now. I ask all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to support this amendment to protect against foreign interference in America's elections.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not necessarily opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have had the opportunity to travel the country with my friend and colleague Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE on the subject of the Voting Rights Act.

We have heard testimony that minority turnout across the board was higher than ever: Hispanic and Asian communities jumped 13 points above the turnout levels in 2014 when compared to the 2018 election cycle; this last midterm, in 2018, African American turnout jumped 11 points.

I hope this trend continues, and I hope we see increased minority turnout in our upcoming elections.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, in closing, I urge both Democrats and Republicans to support this commonsense amendment to prevent malicious misinformation and propaganda campaigns from targeting African American and other minority communities.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 7, strike “and”

Page 33, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

“(2) an analysis of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on influencing military and veteran communities and the success or failure of these efforts, together with recommendations to address these efforts in future elections; and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

□ 1715

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, today I rise in support of my amendment to help protect our Nation's veterans and servicemembers from targeted disinformation campaigns bankrolled by foreign governments.

Earlier this month the Republican-led Senate Intelligence Committee released its report on Russia's attempts to interfere with the 2016 U.S. Presidential election. In that report, the committee described how Russian-influenced operatives created fake online personas to target specific groups, including veterans, with the goal of sowing discord in the American political system.

To that end, operatives created social media pages impersonating congressionally-chartered veteran service organizations, or VSOs, to push their divisive message. In one such case, a page impersonating Vietnam Veterans of America run by a troll farm in Bulgaria grew to nearly 200,000 followers before it was shut down.

After learning of this illicit account, VVA launched their own 2-year investigation into the issue, and they found more than 150 similar efforts across every major social media platform.

And while I think their actions are reprehensible, I have to admit that their approach makes sense. Numerous studies have shown that veterans vote at higher rates than those who haven't served. And those votes are especially concentrated in swing states. In my South Carolina district, veterans make up nearly 13 percent of the voting population, so I for one prefer my chances against a fellow American, rather than a campaign run out of a troll farm in Saint Petersburg.

Joking aside, it is unacceptable that we are allowing those same men and women who have served our Nation overseas to be susceptible to these malign influences. That is why I am proud to support the underlying bill, which would prohibit foreign governments from sponsoring influenced campaigns designed to affect the outcome of a Federal election.

But since we know that foreign adversaries aren't interested in playing by our own rules, my amendment would require the FEC to investigate those foreign influence campaigns after each election so we can put a stop to them.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as much as I would like to have some fun with my good friend and colleague from South Carolina and oppose this amendment and have great debate back and forth, it is a pretty darn good amendment.

I think we need to do everything we can in a bipartisan way to make sure that our Nation's heroes have the right to vote not only here at home, but abroad.

I look forward to working with you—after this bill that will pass today on a partisan roll call but will go nowhere—to make sure that our Nation's heroes are not adversely affected by any propaganda or any attempts to stop them from exercising that right.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, in closing, I want to thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership on the House Administration Committee and all the members of the committee for their work on this critical legislation. I also want to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and the members of the Rules Committee for allowing my amendments to come to the floor. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. DAVIS, across the aisle for his work. And I hope that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting my straightforward, commonsense amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 8, strike “and a list” and insert “a list”.

Page 23, line 11, strike the period and insert the following: “, and, if the person pur-

chasing the advertisement is acting as the agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), a statement that the person is acting as the agent of a foreign principal and the identification of the foreign principal involved.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act.

Today the House is discussing and debating how we can safeguard the integrity of our elections, the bedrock of our democracy. How do we protect our electoral systems from foreign threats? And how do we prevent foreign influence over our electorate?

As we stand here today, the number of countries engaged in active campaigns to mislead the electorate, the American people continues to grow. According to a new report from the University of Oxford, the number of countries engaged in disinformation campaigns has more than doubled in the last 2 years. Additionally, at least seven countries have used their intelligence or military apparatuses to deploy disinformation on social media to influence a foreign country and its people.

As a former intelligence officer, I recognize the risks that these potential attacks, yes, attacks, pose as we head into the next year's Federal, State, and local elections. There is a legitimate fear across our intelligence community that foreign governments will build on Russia's extensive information warfare strategy. Foreign actors from Russia to China to North Korea to Iran are eager to undermine the foundations of our democracy.

Leading up to the 2016 Presidential election Facebook disclosed that it had found more than \$100,000 worth of ads on divisive issues purchased by a Russian company linked to the Kremlin, and the potential return on investment is extremely high. As we approach 2020, they have every reason to follow this playbook again and to strengthen their disinformation operations.

In the context of these threats, we need to take a serious look at how we build resiliency against foreign interference on social media platforms. Digital advertising can be a far less expensive and time intensive as a tool for propaganda, and it can spread disinformation, confusion, hate, and division at an alarming rate.

The SHIELD Act takes real steps to require large online platforms to keep records of qualified political advertisements, and I would like to thank my colleagues for their hard work on this critical issue.

The SHIELD Act would require online companies to keep publicly available records about online digital political advertisements. It would require

information about the contents of a specific advertisement, its target audience, and the issue it addresses.

Additionally, it would require disclosure information about those purchasing the advertisement. Disclosure sheds light on corruption. It unmasks influence. And it stops our democracy from becoming vulnerable to foreign governments, nonstate actors, and shadowy influence groups constantly working to distract and mislead the American people. My amendment would strengthen this disclosure requirement.

My amendment would add that online platforms need to include a statement when the person purchasing a political advertisement is acting as the agent of a foreign principal.

Not only would it include language making it clear that they are acting on behalf of a foreign entity, but it would require the online platform to identify the foreign principal involved. That principal could be a foreign government, a foreign political party or a nonstate actor.

Fundamentally, my amendment to the SHIELD Act would put the power back in the hands of the American people. It would help address a critical underlying question, who is in charge of deciding American elections? Is it those abroad, working to divide and influence the American people? Or is it the American people themselves?

By requiring online records of purchase requests that include public information on the foreign principal behind these advertisements, the American people will be able to see clearly who is attempting to influence their decisions.

As Congress acts today to restore the trust of those we serve in our system of government, my amendment would strengthen our efforts to prevent the spread of foreign influence in our democratic system.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 4617 to increase transparency in online advertisements, something that should not be controversial.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Virginia for offering this amendment, but this amendment shares the same flaw as the main text of the bill, putting media platforms in charge of enforcing our Nation's laws.

They are not doing a good job right now. I don't know if Mr. Zuckerberg is still across the street testifying in front of the Financial Services Committee, but if they were doing a good job, he wouldn't have been here so long.

Rather, we need to strengthen FARA and help the Department of Justice do

its job. I do not understand why the Democrats want the social media companies to have more responsibilities when they failed miserably in 2016.

I strongly urge a “no” vote. I also urge every Member, both Republicans and Democrats, to take a look at my bill. It is a nonpartisan bill.

I don't want to empower the media platforms or restrict speech by American citizens. I want to give the DOJ the resources to do its job.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, the purpose of this amendment is, in fact, to ensure that the American people are aware when an agent of a foreign principal under FARA parameters purchases a political advertisement. We, as Members of Congress, have the ability to set the parameters under which the transparency and information is available to the American public. And in doing so, we need to make sure that not only do the American people know when there is a foreign individual purchasing advertisements meant to influence them, but when someone else is purchasing those advertisements on behalf of a foreign entity as described by FARA.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's willingness to want to help fix a bill where the underlying bill is one that we never had a chance to have an open debate about, never had a chance to have hearings about.

When it doesn't pass, I look forward to working with my colleagues. When it doesn't pass into law—it will pass here on a partisan roll call—when it doesn't pass into law, I look forward to working with my colleagues.

But I do have a bill that would address this situation. FARA, let's work together to let the DOJ have the resources and the ability to do their job. The SHIELD Act is not allowing that to happen. The Honest Elections Act, my bill, will allow that to happen. I would urge everybody to take a look at that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I also support increasing the enforcement of FARA.

But this, in particular, is about transparency and the transparency that it brings as it relates to the underlying aspect of the Honest Ads Act, which is a bipartisan bill, Republicans and Democrats in equal amounts. This is about transparency. This is about allowing the American people to know who, in fact, is purchasing the ads that are meant to influence them.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-253 offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 231, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

#### AYES—180

Abraham	Gosar	Nunes
Aderholt	Granger	Olson
Allen	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Amash	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Pence
Babin	Green (TN)	Perry
Bacon	Griffith	Posey
Baird	Guest	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Guthrie	Reed
Banks	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Barr	Harris	Riggleman
Bergman	Hartzler	Roby
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Herrera Beutler	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Hill (AR)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rose, John W.
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Buchanan	Hudson	Roy
Buck	Huizenga	Rutherford
Bucshon	Hunter	Scalise
Budd	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Burchett	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Calvert	Jordan	Simpson
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Carter (TX)	Katko	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Cheney	King (IA)	Spano
Cline	King (NY)	Stauber
Cloud	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Comer	LaHood	Stewart
Conaway	LaMalfa	Taylor
Cook	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crawford	Latta	Tipton
Crenshaw	Lesko	Turner
Curtis	Long	Upton
Davidson (OH)	Loudermilk	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Walberg
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Walker
Duncan	Marshall	Walorski
Dunn	Massie	Waltz
Emmer	Mast	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Flores	McClintock	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McHenry	Westerman
Fox (NC)	McKinley	Williams
Fulcher	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Miller	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Womack
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gibbs	Mullin	Wright
Gohmert	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Young
Gooden	Norman	Zeldin

#### NOES—231

Adams	Allred	Barragán
Aguilar	Axne	Bass

Beatty	Grijalva	Pappas
Bera	Haaland	Pascarell
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hayes	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Phillips
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Hill (CA)	Plaskett
F.	Himes	Pocan
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Pressley
Brownley (CA)	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Raskin
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Case	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ryan
Ciçilline	Khanna	Sablan
Cisneros	Kildee	San Nicolas
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Cohen	Lamb	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lawrence	Scott, David
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Craig	Lee (NV)	Shalala
Crist	Levin (CA)	Sherman
Crow	Levin (MI)	Sherrill
Cuellar	Lewis	Sires
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Slotkin
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Soto
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Spanberger
Dean	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lowe y	Stanton
DeGette	Lujan	Stevens
DeLauro	Lynch	Suo zzi
DeBene	Malinowski	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Deutch	Matsui	Tlaib
Dingell	McAdams	Tonko
Doggett	McBath	Torres (CA)
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Torres Small
F.	McGovern	(NM)
Engel	McNerney	Trahan
Escobar	Meeke s	Trone
Espallat	Meng	Underwood
Evans	Moore	Van Drew
Finkenauer	Morelle	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Veasey
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell	Vela
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Frankel	Nadler	Visclosky
Fudge	Napolitano	Wasserman
Gallo	Neal	Schultz
Garamendi	Neguse	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Norton	Welch
Golden	O'Halleran	Wexton
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Gonzalez (TX)	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Gottheimer	Pallone	Yarmuth
Green, Al (TX)	Panetta	

#### NOT VOTING—26

Amodei	Grothman	Peters
Armstrong	Joyce (PA)	Radewagen
Bilirakis	Keller	Reschenthaler
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Eshoo	Kind	Steil
Estes	Luria	Stivers
Gabbard	McEachin	Takano
González-Colón	Meuser	Thompson (PA)
(PR)	Mitchell	Timmons

□ 1759

Messrs. RUSH, VAN DREW, Ms. WILD, and Mr. LOWENTHAL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.



The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4617) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 650, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4617 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike subsection (b) of section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

#### TITLE I—FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION REFORM

Sec. 101. Clarification of coverage of activities directed within the United States by agents outside of United States.

Sec. 102. Application of press exemption to other forms of media for purposes of engagement in political activities.

Sec. 103. Treatment of activities to influence public opinion on elections as political activity.

Sec. 104. Effective date.

#### TITLE II—DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

Sec. 201. Clarifying disclaimer requirements for online political advertisements.

#### TITLE III—REDUCING ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN ELECTIONS

Sec. 301. Report on illicit foreign money in Federal elections.

Sec. 302. Prohibition on contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connections with ballot initiatives and referenda.

#### TITLE IV—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING BALLOT HARVESTING

Sec. 401. Prohibition on payments to States allowing collection and transmission of ballots by certain third parties.

#### TITLE V—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

Sec. 501. Prohibition on payments to States allowing voting by non-citizens.

#### TITLE VI—INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Sec. 601. Inadmissibility and deportability of aliens engaging in improper interference in United States elections.

#### TITLE I—FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION REFORM

##### SEC. 101. CLARIFICATION OF COVERAGE OF ACTIVITIES DIRECTED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES BY AGENTS OUTSIDE OF UNITED STATES.

(a) TREATMENT OF AGENTS ENGAGED IN ACTIVITIES AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.—Section 1(c)(1) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of clause (iii);

(2) by striking “and” at the end of clause (iv) and inserting “or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) engages outside the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal which are directed at persons within the United States, including activities consisting of communications disseminated within the United States through telecommunications or computer equipment or services, the Internet, broadcast, cable, satellite, print, or mail; and”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 619) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and shall be applicable outside the United States to the extent described in section 1(c)(1)(v).”.

##### SEC. 102. APPLICATION OF PRESS EXEMPTION TO OTHER FORMS OF MEDIA FOR PURPOSES OF ENGAGEMENT IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 1(d) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(d)” and insert “(d)(1)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) In addition to the exception described in paragraph (1), to the extent that a person engages with the United States in political activities, the term ‘agent of a foreign principal’ does not include any bona fide media outlet organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place

subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any bona fide media outlet for which there is on file with the United States Postal Service information in compliance with section 3685 of title 39, United States Code, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of paid advertisements, subscriptions, free social media access which is made available to the general public, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 per centum beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such media outlet is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by, any foreign principal defined in subsection (b), or by any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(q) The term ‘media outlet’ means any of the following:

“(1) Any newspaper, magazine, or periodical.

“(2) Any broadcast, satellite or cable television or radio station.

“(3) Any Internet-based website, application, or platform.”.

##### SEC. 103. TREATMENT OF ACTIVITIES TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC OPINION ON ELECTIONS AS POLITICAL ACTIVITY.

Section 1(o) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(o)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: “, or with reference to public opinion about public officials, candidates, or elections of the United States.”.

##### SEC. 104. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to activities carried out on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### TITLE II—DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

##### SEC. 201. CLARIFYING DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS.

(a) CLARIFICATION.—Section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.—

“(1) METHOD OF PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), a covered Internet communication shall provide the information required under this section on the face of the communication.

“(2) AUTHORIZING USE OF ALTERNATIVE MECHANISMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a covered Internet communication described in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (4), the communication may provide the information required under this section through the use of a technological mechanism described in subparagraph (B), so long as the communication presents an indicator described in subparagraph (C).

“(B) TECHNOLOGICAL MECHANISM DESCRIBED.—A technological mechanism described in this subparagraph is, with respect to a communication, any technology which enables the individual reading, observing, or listening to the communication to read, observe, or listen to the information required under this section without navigating more than one step away from the communication itself. Such mechanism may take any form, including hover-over, mouse-over, voice-

over, rollover, pop-up screen, scrolling text, rotating panels, or click-through or hyperlink to a landing page.

“(C) INDICATOR DESCRIBED.—An indicator described in this subparagraph is, with respect to a communication, any clear and conspicuous visible or audible element of the communication that gives notice to the individual reading, observing, or listening to the communication that the individual may read, observe, or listen to the information required under this section through a technological mechanism. An indicator may take any form, including words such as ‘Paid for by’, ‘Paid by’, ‘Sponsored by’, or ‘Ad by’, a website URL, an image, a sound, a symbol, or an icon.

“(3) WAIVER.—A disclaimer shall not be required for any covered internet communication that cannot provide a clear and conspicuous statement of the information required under this section either on the face of communication or through the use of a technological mechanism under paragraph (2).

“(4) COVERED INTERNET COMMUNICATION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered Internet communication’ means any communication which is required to include information under this section and which is any of the following:

“(A) Any electronic mailing of more than 500 substantially similar communications which is disseminated by a political committee.

“(B) Any communication disseminated on a publicly-available website of a political committee.

“(C) Any communication placed for a fee on another person’s website or Internet-based application or platform.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to communications made after the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

### TITLE III—REDUCING ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN ELECTIONS

#### SEC. 301. REPORT ON ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 319 the following new section:

##### “SEC. 319A. REPORT ON PRESENCE OF ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY.

“(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each Federal election cycle, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report containing—

“(1) an analysis of the presence of illicit foreign money in such cycle; and

“(2) recommendations to address the presence of illicit foreign money in elections, as appropriate.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

“(1) The term ‘Federal election cycle’ means the period which begins on the day after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office and which ends on the date of the first regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held after such date.

“(2) The term ‘illicit foreign money’ means any disbursement by a foreign national (as defined in section 319(b)) prohibited under such section.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the Federal election cycle that began during November 2018, and each succeeding Federal election cycle.

#### SEC. 302. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52

U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “election” and inserting the following: “election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

### TITLE IV—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING BALLOT HARVESTING

#### SEC. 401. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

##### “PART 7—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES

#### “SEC. 297. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS OF STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A State is not eligible to receive funds under this Act unless the State has in effect a law that prohibits an individual from the knowing collection and transmission of a ballot in an election for Federal office that was mailed to another person, other than an individual described as follows:

“(1) An election official while engaged in official duties as authorized by law.

“(2) An employee of the United States Postal Service while engaged in official duties as authorized by law.

“(3) Any other individual who is allowed by law to collect and transmit United States mail, while engaged in official duties as authorized by law.

“(4) A family member, household member, or caregiver of the person to whom the ballot was mailed.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, with respect to a person to whom the ballot was mailed:

“(1) The term ‘caregiver’ means an individual who provides medical or health care assistance to such person in a residence, nursing care institution, hospice facility, assisted living center, assisted living facility, assisted living home, residential care institution, adult day health care facility, or adult foster care home.

“(2) The term ‘family member’ means an individual who is related to such person by blood, marriage, adoption or legal guardianship.

“(3) The term ‘household member’ means an individual who resides at the same residence as such person.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 296 the following new item:

##### “PART 7—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES

“Sec. 297. Eligibility for payments of States allowing collection and transmission of ballots by certain third parties.”.

### TITLE V—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

#### SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C.

21001 et seq.), as amended by section 401, is further amended by adding at the end the following new part:

##### “PART 8—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

#### “SEC. 298. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS OF STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS.

“‘A State is not eligible to receive funds under this Act if the State allows an individual who is not a citizen of the United States to vote in an election for public office.’.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act, as amended by section 401, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 297 the following new item:

##### “PART 8—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

“Sec. 298. Eligibility for payments of States allowing voting by non-citizens.”.

### TITLE VI—INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER ELECTION INTERFERENCE

#### SEC. 601. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN UNITED STATES ELECTIONS.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.—Any alien who a consular officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe, is seeking admission to the United States to engage in improper interference in a United States election, or has engaged in improper interference in a United States election, is inadmissible.”.

(b) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.—Any alien who has engaged, is engaged, or at any time after admission engages in improper interference in a United States election is deportable.”.

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 101(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(53) The term ‘improper interference in a United States election’ means conduct by an alien that—

“(A)(i) violates Federal criminal, voting rights, or campaign finance law, or

“(ii) is performed by any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign government or criminal enterprise; and

“(B) includes any covert, fraudulent, deceptive, or unlawful act or attempted act, undertaken with the purpose or effect of undermining public confidence in election processes or institutions, or influencing, undermining confidence in, or altering the result or reported result of, a general or primary Federal, State, or local election or caucus, including—

“(i) the campaign of a candidate; or

“(ii) a ballot measure, including an amendment, a bond issue, an initiative, a recall, a referral, or a referendum.”.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit, a proposal that would actually assist law enforcement in pursuing those individuals who seek to disrupt our elections, as opposed to the partisan bill we have been debating here today.

I first want to address some of the accusations made here today about how my colleagues and I on this side of the aisle do not care about election security or how we are the only thing standing in the way of securing elections. This is simply not true.

In the 115th Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress appropriated over \$400 million to the States and to DHS prior to the 2018 midterms to bolster election security, allowing for unprecedented cooperation between DHS and all 50 States and 1,400 localities. Earlier this year, \$33 million was appropriated to DHS to continue these assistance efforts.

I also introduced a bill during the debate of the SAFE Act that will provide even more funding for DHS to combat nefarious activity. But last week, I introduced, along with many of my colleagues, the Honest Elections Act, which the entire basis for this motion to recommit is based upon. So don't tell me that we on this side of the aisle are standing in the way.

According to the report recently released by the Senate Intelligence Committee, out of the \$1.4 billion spent on digital political ads in the 2016 election cycle, Russia spent \$100,000 over 2 years on Facebook ads. The majority of those were not election ads, so they wouldn't necessarily be regulated by the Honest Ads Act portion of SHIELD and will not address the real threat that we saw in 2016.

My motion today strengthens and reforms the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA, to combat election interference. It modernizes online political ad disclosure. It increases monitoring of spending by foreign nationals in elections. It incentivizes States to prohibit the practice of ballot harvesting and encourages States to stop this recent trend of noncitizen voting.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit because I was given some advice by our colleague from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) before I came up here. He said: "The more you talk, the fewer votes this MTR will get."

So, let's make sure everyone goes back to their districts. But first, vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect our elections from interference from foreign countries like Russia, China, and all others. Vote to hunt down those who are attempting to interfere in our elections. And vote, finally, to restore the American people's trust in our institutions.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that this motion to recommit should be opposed. It is so much weaker than the bill that we have an opportunity to pass to get foreign interference out of our elections so that millions of Americans are not exposed unwittingly to ads by Russian trolls.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this blatant attempt to help foreign agents subvert our democracy.

Madam Speaker, we stand at the crossroads of history. Foreign enemies have attacked our elections in a sweeping and systematic fashion, and they are continuing to do so.

We are faced today with a very simple question: Should Iran, Russia, and China be allowed to interfere in our elections? Should they have more of a say in who gets elected than our constituents?

Let me tell you my answer. Our soldiers did not fight our enemies overseas just to watch them try to corrupt our democracy here at home. I am not sure when that became a controversial position, but it is a damn shame that it has.

Protecting America should not be a one-party issue. It should be what unites us, not a cause for petty games.

But once again, the minority party has decided it is more important to practice the kind of politics that put them in the minority in the first place. They have decided, yet again, to play another political stunt, just like they played this morning in the SCIF. It is the same exact thing.

That is your choice. My choice is to stand up to say American elections are for Americans only.

The SHIELD Act puts forward critical reforms to improve our defenses against foreign influence and interference. The bill strengthens reporting requirements, closes loopholes, and deters illegal foreign activity in our elections.

I can understand if some of my colleagues are worried that they cannot win on a fair and level election playing field, but for all those who believe in free and fair elections, who swore an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, I urge you to reject this MTR and stand with the United States of America.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 4617, if ordered; and The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 777.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 225, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

## AYES—182

Abraham	Gooden	Nunes
Aderholt	Gosar	Olson
Allen	Gottheimer	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (LA)	Perry
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Posey
Baird	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Griffith	Reed
Banks	Guest	Rice (SC)
Barr	Guthrie	Riggleman
Bergman	Hagedorn	Roby
Biggs	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brindisi	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Roy
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Buck	Hudson	Scalise
Bucshon	Huizenga	Schweikert
Budd	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Katko	Spano
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Staubert
Cline	King (IA)	Stefanik
Cloud	King (NY)	Stewart
Cole	Kinzinger	Taylor
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Thornberry
Conaway	LaHood	Tipton
Cook	LaMalfa	Turner
Crawford	Lamborn	Upton
Crenshaw	Latta	Van Drew
Curtis	Lesko	Wagner
Davidson (OH)	Long	Walberg
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Walden
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walker
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Duncan	Marchant	Waltz
Dunn	Marshall	Watkins
Emmer	Massie	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	Mast	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McCaul	Westerman
Flores	McClintock	Williams
Fortenberry	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Fox (NC)	McKinley	Wittman
Fulcher	Meadows	Womack
Gaetz	Miller	Woodall
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Wright
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gibbs	Mullin	Young
Gohmert	Murphy (NC)	Zeldin
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	

## NOES—225

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bonamici	Case
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Casten (IL)
Axne	F.	Castor (FL)
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Beatty	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Cisneros
Beyer	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Clay

Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cunningham  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Español  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill (CA)  
Himes  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)

Johnson (TX)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Phillips  
Pingree

Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suo zzi  
Swailwell (CA)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—24

Amodei  
Armstrong  
Bilirakis  
Collins (GA)  
Estes  
Gabbard  
Grothman  
Joyce (PA)

Keller  
Kelly (PA)  
Kind  
McEachin  
Meuser  
Mitchell  
Newhouse  
Peters

Resenthaler  
Smucker  
Steube  
Stivers  
Takano  
Thompson (PA)  
Timmons

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1816

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 181, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

## AYES—227

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brindisi  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Ciocilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cunningham  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Español  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)

Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill (CA)  
Himes  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suo zzi  
Swailwell (CA)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)

## NOES—181

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen

Amash  
Arrington  
Babin

Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bishop (NC)  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)

Griffith  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Miller  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer

## NOT VOTING—23

Amodei  
Armstrong  
Bilirakis  
Collins (GA)  
Estes  
Gabbard  
Grothman  
Joyce (PA)

Keller  
Kelly (PA)  
Kind  
McEachin  
Meuser  
Mitchell  
Peters  
Reschenthaler

Smucker  
Steil  
Steube  
Stivers  
Takano  
Thompson (PA)  
Timmons

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1824

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 777) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

YEAS—402

Abraham	Curtis	Horn, Kendra S.
Adams	Davidson (OH)	Horsford
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Houlihan
Aguilar	Davis, Danny K.	Hoyer
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Allred	Dean	Huffman
Arrington	DeFazio	Huizenga
Axne	DeGette	Hunter
Babin	DeLauro	Hurd (TX)
Bacon	DelBene	Johnson Lee
Baird	Delgado	Jayapal
Balderson	Demings	Jeffries
Banks	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Barr	DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)
Barragán	Deutch	Johnson (OH)
Beatty	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)
Bera	Dingell	Johnson (TX)
Bergman	Doggett	Jordan
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Joyce (OH)
Biggs	F.	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Duncan	Katko
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Keating
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	Engel	Kelly (MS)
Blunt Rochester	Escobar	Kennedy
Bonamici	Eshoo	Khanna
Bost	Española	Kildee
Boyle, Brendan	Evans	Kilmer
F.	Ferguson	Kim
Brady	Finkenauer	King (IA)
Brindisi	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Kinzing
Brooks (IN)	Fletcher	Kirkpatrick
Brown (MD)	Flores	Krishnamoorthi
Brownley (CA)	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Buchanan	Foster	Kustoff (TN)
Buck	Fox (NC)	LaHood
Bucshon	Frankel	LaMalfa
Budd	Fudge	Lamb
Burchett	Fulcher	Lamborn
Burgess	Gaetz	Langevin
Bustos	Gallagher	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Byrne	Garamendi	Latta
Calvert	Garcia (IL)	Lawrence
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Lawson (FL)
Cárdenas	Gianforte	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Gibbs	Lee (NV)
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Golden	Levin (CA)
Cartwright	Gomez	Levin (MI)
Case	Gonzalez (OH)	Lewis
Casten (IL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lieu, Ted
Castor (FL)	Gooden	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Gosar	Loeb
Chabot	Gottheimer	Loeb
Cheney	Granger	Long
Chu, Judy	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Cicilline	Graves (LA)	Lowenthal
Cisneros	Graves (MO)	Lowey
Clark (MA)	Green (TN)	Lucas
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Clay	Griffith	Lujan
Cline	Grijalva	Luria
Cloud	Guest	Lynch
Clyburn	Guthrie	Malinowski
Cohen	Haaland	Maloney
Cole	Hagedorn	Maloney, Sean
Comer	Harder (CA)	Marchant
Conaway	Harris	Marshall
Connolly	Hartzler	Massie
Cook	Hastings	Mast
Cooper	Hayes	Matsui
Correa	Heck	McAdams
Costa	Hern, Kevin	McBath
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy
Cox (CA)	Hice (GA)	McCaul
Craig	Higgins (LA)	McClintock
Crawford	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Crenshaw	Hill (AR)	McGovern
Crist	Hill (CA)	McHenry
Crow	Himes	McKinley
Cuellar	Holding	McNerney
Cunningham	Hollingsworth	

Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Meeks	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Meng	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Miller	Rose (NY)	Thornberry
Moolenaar	Rose, John W.	Tipton
Mooney (WV)	Rouda	Titus
Moore	Rouzer	Tlaib
Morelle	Roy	Tonko
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Torres (CA)
Mucarsel-Powell	Ruiz	Torres Small
Mullin	Ruppersberger	(NM)
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Trahan
Murphy (NC)	Rutherford	Trone
Nadler	Ryan	Turner
Napolitano	Sánchez	Underwood
Neal	Sarbanes	Upton
Neguse	Scalise	Van Drew
Newhouse	Scanlon	Vargas
Norcross	Schakowsky	Veasey
Nunes	Schiff	Vela
O'Halloran	Schneider	Velázquez
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrader	Visclosky
Olson	Schrier	Wagner
Omar	Schweikert	Walberg
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Walden
Pallone	Scott, Austin	Walker
Palmer	Scott, David	Walorski
Panetta	Sensenbrenner	Waltz
Pappas	Serrano	Wasserman
Pascarella	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Payne	Shalala	Waters
Pence	Sherman	Watkins
Perlmutter	Sherrill	Watson Coleman
Perry	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Peterson	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Phillips	Sires	Welch
Pingree	Slotkin	Wenstrup
Pocan	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Porter	Smith (NE)	Wexton
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Wild
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Williams
Price (NC)	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Quigley	Spanberger	Wilson (SC)
Ratcliffe	Spano	Wittman
Reed	Speier	Womack
Rice (NY)	Stanton	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Staub	Wright
Richmond	Stefanik	Yarmuth
Riggleman	Stevens	Yoho
Roby	Stewart	Young
Rodgers (WA)	Suozzi	Zeldin
Roe, David P.	Swalwell (CA)	

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei	Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler
Armstrong	Keller	Smucker
Bass	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Bilirakis	Kind	Steube
Cleaver	McEachin	Stivers
Collins (GA)	Meuser	Takano
Dauids (KS)	Mitchell	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Norman	Timmons
Gabbard	Peters	
Grothman	Raskin	

□ 1831

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 568 (H. Res. 630 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 569 (H.R. 4406 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 570 (H.R. 4407 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 577 (H.R. 2513 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 578 (H.R. 2426 final passage); “yea” on rollcall No. 583 (H.R. 4617 final passage); and “yea” on rollcall No. 584 (H.R. 777 final passage).

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, please accept the following vote recommendations in my absence as I represent the United States at the formal ascension of the Emperor in

Japan. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 579, “yea” on rollcall No. 580, “nay” on rollcall No. 581, “nay” on rollcall No. 582, “yea” on rollcall No. 583, and “yea” on rollcall No. 584.

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING 241 AMERICAN HEROES KILLED IN 1983 BEIRUT BARRACKS BOMBING

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, friends, colleagues, and distinguished guests in the gallery, we are gathered here today on the 36th anniversary of the 1983 Beirut barracks bombing to honor 241 American heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice.

The 241 names—220 of which are my fellow Marines—will be forever etched in our hearts and on the walls of the Beirut Memorial in Jacksonville, North Carolina.

Although you may not recognize these names, they are the names of sons, brothers, fathers, and friends. They are the names of true American patriots who came in peace and were stolen from us by an act of pure evil. They are the heroes who gave their lives so we could keep ours.

Semper fidelis means “always faithful.” It is the motto of the United States Marine Corps. Today, we remember the 241 fallen heroes of Beirut. Today, we remain faithful.

Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members and distinguished guests in the gallery rise for a moment of silence.

#### HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2019, TO MONDAY OCTOBER 28, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 28, 2019, when it should convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUDA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Louisiana for yielding.

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business; the last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by close of business on Friday.

The House will consider H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act; H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act; and H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. These three bills all recognize the need to protect some of America's most iconic and important public lands.

The House, Mr. Speaker, will also consider H.R. 4695, the Protect Against Conflict by Turkey Act. This bipartisan legislation, cosponsored by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, provides a strong, targeted response to the crisis caused by Turkey's invasion of Northern Syria.

It sanctions senior Turkish officials involved in the decision and those committing human rights abuses, and penalizes Turkish financial institutions involved in perpetuating President Erdogan's practices.

Lastly, the House will consider H.Res 296 affirming the United States' record on the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response.

I would like the gentleman to walk through, if he could, the scheduling process for how the House will further proceed with the impeachment inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot respond to that at this point in time. We haven't made that decision to move ahead. The committees, as the gentleman knows, are considering it, and if they decide that the House should move forward, then we will make that decision.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I, again, ask the question I had asked last week:

Are we currently in an impeachment inquiry, as the Speaker said we are a few weeks ago?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will respond as I responded last week. We are doing our constitutional duty of oversight of the administration and the actions of the President of the United States to determine whether or not there had been violations of law, whether the President has committed high crimes and misdemeanors. And when those hearings are concluded, obviously, they will make some deter-

mination and make recommendations to the House, as they do with other matters that the committees consider.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As this determination moves forward, there is a growing cry for fairness. And I know we talked a little bit about that last week, but we saw it again this week with more closed hearings, more hearings where both sides were not allowed the same equal rights that have always been provided in impeachment inquiries.

And, of course, when you look through our Nation's history, fortunately, there are not that many instances where Congress had to try to impeach or inquire about impeaching a President—three times.

In fact, in all three cases, it started with a vote of the full House, and it started with a fair set of rules. And in the last two that were the most public, where you saw the proceedings on television, you saw both sides vote for Nixon, where you had a divided government. You had a Democrat House and a Republican President.

And then, for the Clinton impeachment, you had a Republican House and a Democrat President. They used the same set of rules. Both sides got to call witnesses, both sides got to subpoena. The President's legal counsel actually got to be in the room and, maybe most importantly, the public got to be in the room.

Members of Congress, even if they weren't on the relevant committees, were allowed to watch these hearings. That is not going on today. These hearings are going on in secret in a secret room.

A number of my colleagues and I went down to see what was going on, to see the hearings and the proceedings. It turned out, what we found out in the SCIF, which is designed for classified briefings, it wasn't a classified briefing. The chairman, himself, acknowledged that it was not a classified briefing. In fact, it included a Department of Defense official. And members of the Committee on Armed Services asked if they would be able to participate in that hearing, and they were denied the ability.

And so when the press can't see what's going on, when the public can't see what's going on, when Members of Congress try to see what is going on, and the chairman takes the witness and runs out of the room, it begs the question, "What are they trying to hide?"

What kind of tainted document are they creating, if it is an impeachment inquiry?

And if it is not, then stop trying to use two different sets of rules. But if it is—and the Speaker, herself, is the one who said it is an impeachment inquiry—at a minimum, use the same standards that have always been used for that serious of a process. The House of Representatives has a constitutional ability to ultimately make this kind of decision.

And, again, it has only been done three times, but in each of those cases, there were fair sets of rules used, so that you could actually find out what was happening. And if there was something that reached the level of high crimes and misdemeanors, it was not based on what one person decided, but based on everybody being able to present the evidence, everybody being able to bring witnesses forward. That is not happening right now, and it ought to change.

And I would hope, and ask the gentleman, if this is going to continue moving forward, if there is going to be any credibility to whatever report would come out of it.

There is much less credibility if it is done in secret with one person and one person only getting to choose who comes forth to testify, as opposed to an open process, as has always been the case in our country's history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times the gentleman from Louisiana, the Republican whip, says that these are unfair hearings, or that they are secret hearings, or that Republicans can't participate, no matter how many times he says that, it will not be true.

□ 1845

He talks about secret hearings. I will show you the front page of The Washington Post about the hearing yesterday. It is on the front page.

Now, I know your Members can read. There are over 105 Members, 40 or so of your Members, who are authorized to sit in the committee.

The President, Mr. Speaker, called the Republicans, and he has tweeted about how they need to be tougher.

What I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: When are they going to focus on defending the Constitution of the United States?

I ask the gentleman: Does he believe that the President is above the law?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would imagine the gentleman would also agree that the chairman of the Intelligence Committee should also not be above the law. He should not be able to write his own rules of impeachment, his own rules of engagement, in secret.

These meetings are being held in secret. In fact, when some of us went into the room today, he ran out with the witness.

What are you trying to hide when, as any kind of secret hearing, people run out of the room as soon as the lights come on? What is really going on?

If you want to talk about numbers—Mr. HOYER. Read the paper.

Mr. SCALISE. The sad part is, the only way you can find out what happens in those secret hearings is reading the paper because somebody on the majority staff is, against the direction of the chairman, selectively leaking information to the press.



The press knows more about this impeachment inquiry than voting Members of Congress. Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of this Congress is denied access to those hearings, 75 percent.

Maybe you can read what was leaked by somebody on your majority staff, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is where you can get your information because that is the only place to get information. That shouldn't be where Members of Congress have to go to find out what happened.

By the way, you talk to some of the people who were in the room, and they were directed by the chairman not to say anything. He can say something or somebody on his staff can say something, and he hasn't done anything to control the leaks. But then they say, actually, there was a lot of other testimony that contradicted what was leaked to the paper. But nobody really knows because they are denied access.

Do you know, if you take the voting Members of Congress who are not allowed in that room, it represents over 230 million American citizens who are denied representation in those impeachment hearings, over 230 million Americans who are denied access because 75 percent of voting Members of Congress are not allowed in the room?

You can talk about who is allowed in the room. Everybody should be allowed in the room. The press should be allowed in the room. Cameras should be in the room, like in previous impeachments.

If you want to try to remove a President—maybe you don't agree with the 2016 election result, and you are concerned about what might happen next year. That is not why you impeach a President, by the way.

But if you really do want to search for the truth, you search for the truth in public. The people of this country ought to be able to see what is happening. It shouldn't be a selected story in the newspaper that was leaked by the majority staff. It should be something every Member of Congress who is going to be asked to vote on this actually can find something out about.

We can't go and read the transcripts. Seventy-five percent of us can't. Yet, that is the process that is going on right now.

If you want to call that fair, maybe it is fair to you, but is it really the justice that we look for across the street at the Supreme Court?

Imagine if only one side—the accused couldn't present witnesses. You could accuse anybody of anything. And you have that ability, as you are doing right now, and then you tie the hands behind the back of those you are accusing because they can't even be in the room.

The other side can't even bring witnesses forward. There are witnesses that our Members would like to bring forward who were in that room, yet they are not even allowed that opportunity. That is not fair. Maybe in the Soviet Union that is fair, but not in the United States of America.

It is not how you should be running an impeachment operation to try to take out a President of the United States when we have an election next year. Let the people of this country make that decision, not one person sitting in a secret room downstairs, keeping other people out. When Members of Congress who are trying to find out what is going on walk in the room, he runs out of the room with the witness.

Is that really the fair process that this country deserves? It falls well short. We can absolutely do better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the whip did not answer my question. I said, is the President above the law?

But he wants to pound on the table, Mr. Speaker, because neither the facts nor the law is on his side.

The process is consistent with the rules put in place by the current Secretary of State, Mr. Pompeo, and Mr. Trey Gowdy, who was a Member of this body.

Let me ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker: Does he believe it appropriate that the Congress appropriates \$391 million to help an ally confront Russia—which I understand Mr. Putin probably wasn't for—but does he believe that the President should have withheld that money from Ukraine to defend itself on its eastern front?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, the law requires the President to verify that there is not corruption involved with the taxpayer money that is in question. That is a law we passed. I believe the gentleman from Maryland voted, as I did vote, for that law. It is a good law to say that if we are going to send taxpayer money to a foreign country, we ought to make sure that there is no corruption.

There were claims of corruption in Ukraine. In fact, a lot of the interference in our election by the Russians went through Ukraine in 2016.

Now, President Trump wasn't the President back then when this country was allowing Russia to interfere with the election.

Mr. HOYER. He has no evidence of that. If the gentleman will yield, he has no evidence of that.

Mr. SCALISE. But he is looking into it, as he should be.

Mr. HOYER. He makes a bald-faced assertion that he has no way to back up.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It is not true, in my opinion, but he has no way to back up that statement, and I think the gentleman must know that.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, we can talk about why we needed to root out corruption, why we want to find out what happened in the 2016 election where the Russians tried to interfere, because we don't want it to happen again.

We also know, as it was discussed on that phone call, that President Trump

sold Javelin missiles to Ukraine so they could protect themselves against the Russians, the aggression that the gentleman was talking about on the eastern front, where the previous President allowed the Russians to come into Crimea when Ukraine was asking us to help them.

Ukraine, back when President Obama was in office, was asking us to sell them those same Javelin missiles, and President Obama wouldn't do it. He has never answered why he wouldn't, but it is a fact that he didn't sell the Javelins. But President Trump did and allowed Ukraine to defend themselves against the Russians.

In fact, they talked about maybe buying more, but they were already allowed to buy what they needed to defend themselves, and I am glad they were. It helped a friend.

But you talk about all of those things that are going on right now with impeachment. The real issue is what is not happening here in this Congress.

I will refer you to a different newspaper, as you want to talk about newspapers, the front page of The Washington Times: Democrats writing more subpoenas than laws. Impeachment inquiries sideline Pelosi's agenda.

In fact, if you look at the difference between subpoenas and bills that came out of this House that are actually signed into law, you have produced 56 subpoenas. You have produced only 46 laws. That is 20 percent more subpoenas that you have produced than laws to help people across this country.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman like to know the reason for that?

Mr. SCALISE. I would be happy to yield when we talk about all the things that this House could be doing that it is not, like lowering drug prices, like getting better trade deals with our friends in Mexico and in Canada and in all the other countries that are lined up that would love to come behind USMCA that can't right now.

They can't because there is this infatuation with impeachment, in a one-sided way, in a closed way, in a Soviet-style Star Chamber.

But that is not happening right now. This is what is not happening; this is what is happening. It is not what the American people expected out of this majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a wonderful poster.

Mr. SCALISE. It is factual.

Mr. HOYER. We passed over 250 bills. The Senate won't take them up, particularly one bill that says what 90 percent of the American people want done: Pass a comprehensive background check to make their communities safer.

They won't bring it up. No wonder it can't be signed, because they won't bring up any of our bills.

The Republican leadership in the Senate stops our bills from going to the Senate. They are not even being considered.

Then they have a poster that says you haven't passed any bills? Oh, no, we passed them, and the American people support them.

Yes, we had an election in 2018, and the people spoke, which is why I am the majority leader and you are the minority whip.

So, yes, we honor those elections. And when you were in the majority, you passed bills you wanted to pass.

So, I tell my friend, it is an interesting poster, but it is a reflection of the refusal of the Republicans in the United States Senate to consider legislation supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people. How sad.

But, let me ask you again: Are you saying it was right to keep the \$391 million, to refuse to have a meeting with Mr. Zelensky at the White House until he agreed to conduct a political investigation that would advantage the President of the United States? Do you believe that was right?

Mr. SCALISE. Well, first of all, the gentleman is making an assertion that has been disputed—in fact, disputed by the President of Ukraine, this alleged quid pro quo that didn't happen. Zelensky himself said it didn't happen. In fact, he got the money. He got the money.

Now, we had to check to make sure, like the law says, in two different places. We have two different sets of law that require the administration ensure that there is not corruption before they send the money.

I can assure the gentleman from Maryland that, if he would have sent the money over and there was corruption involved, you would be going after him for breaking the law, for not following the law.

You voted for the law. I voted for the law. Again, it is a good law. But then he ultimately released the money.

You talk about the Javelin missiles. He sold that to them before the phone call even happened because it was a friend saying protect us against Russia.

President Obama wouldn't stand up to Russia when Ukraine made that same phone call, yet President Trump did. President Trump said: I will sell you those missiles so you can protect yourself and can defend yourself against the Russians.

And Zelensky, on that phone call, was thanking the President, again, for selling those missiles to them. It has allowed them to push back the Russian aggression and to root out—ultimately, they talked about rooting out and getting to the bottom of the corruption and the interference that happened with Russia in our 2016 election, which I hoped we would be more vigilant to root out together.

It shouldn't just be President Trump wanting to stop it from happening again. All of us should want to make sure that that doesn't happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, the Acting Chief of Staff, who is, I think, also the acting head of OMB—not technically but actually, in my view—he said there was a quid pro quo. Now, he tried to clean it up. I get that. I get that.

But he said, yes, there was a quid pro quo.

And you read the transcript—which is not a transcript but a report of the substance of the conversation—in which he brings up a number of things, including Joe Biden and Hunter Biden.

And, yes, we now have testimony that says there was a quid pro quo. There was going to be no meeting at the White House. There was going to be no sending of the \$391 million that we thought was essential for our Ukrainian friends defending democracy in Ukraine from Putin.

Now, we have had a more recent action where a telephone conversation with Erdogan led to another headline on that same page: Russia and Turkey reach deal on Syria. America in retreat. America no longer a factor in trying to bring peace.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I asked a question. Is the President above the law?

I asked another question: Is it right to keep the \$391 million that we appropriated because we thought Ukraine was at great risk? And again, the question wasn't answered. It was answered with a question and with an assertion that the President had the authority to make sure that there wasn't corruption in Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned whether there is corruption in the United States of America. That concerns us, and that is why these hearings are proceeding, consistent with our constitutional duty.

And all the Republicans can do is—not defend the actions, because they are indefensible. All they can do is talk about process.

One thousand subpoenas issued by Dan Burton when he was the Republican chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. One hundred subpoenas, unilaterally, under the Gowdy rule, under the Pompeo rule, under the Republican rules, unilaterally.

Trey Gowdy, himself, as chairman of the Benghazi Select Committee, three dozen subpoenas, without any input, under the Gowdy-Pompeo rules.

So I ask the gentleman, do you think it is consistent with our Constitution that the President of the United States suggest to a foreign leader that they become involved in our elections?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is not a question. It is a false assertion that the gentleman is making. And so you can make claims about people, but ultimately, if it is not backed up in fact, you just continue on.

This has been the pattern of this majority, really, since before you took the

majority. It has been an assertion to impeach the President, finding something; if there is nothing there, just keep looking.

You had the Mueller investigation; 2,800 subpoenas, 22 months meandering around, looking for something, hoping; and we saw the chairman of the Intelligence Committee said publicly, time and time again, for 2 years, that he, himself, had more than circumstantial evidence of criminal acts. It turned out there were none.

The chairman never showed the evidence that he had. Maybe he went and had a meeting with Mueller and Mueller discarded it. But if he really did have more than circumstantial evidence, he would have brought it forward. He would have shown all of us, but he didn't. He made the assertion, but it was a false assertion.

And if it wasn't false, by the way, I would challenge the gentleman to bring it forward. He ought to have that duty to bring it forward.

Mr. HOYER. We are in that process.

Mr. SCALISE. No, no. We are talking about the Mueller investigation, but it didn't happen. So the collusion argument that was supposedly going to yield some kind of ability to go and impeach the President didn't turn out to be true.

So, instead of stopping and moving on to the business of the American people, instead of more subpoenas—not laws. No lower drug prices because it is an impeachment infatuation. Instead of moving on, they went to this because there was this whistleblower.

And let's go back to the memo of the whistleblower, before the whistleblower complaint. The whistleblower actually wrote a memo. Admittedly, they never even listened to the phone conversation, but they talked to other people.

And if it was so dangerous what those other people heard, they had a legal ability and authority to go and file their own whistleblower complaint, but they didn't. So someone with a political bias, by the inspector general's own admission, a person with a political bias who had access to information that was classified, in violation of law, hears what they want to hear, writes a memo saying it was crazy; it was disturbing. Those were the words that the whistleblower wrote about the phone conversation.

Lo and behold, the phone conversation gets released by the President. It was unprecedented. He didn't have to do it. I might have preferred if he didn't do it because you don't want a pattern where every conversation between world leaders is going to be out in the public.

But, okay, it is now. And all of those assertions that were made were false. It wasn't a crazy conversation. It wasn't a disturbing conversation. It was two people talking about—one congratulating the other on his election. One talking about how he got elected on a platform of rooting out corruption, which he is doing, and we are

helping them with. That was the conversation.

So now the whistleblower isn't even going to be brought forward, according to the chairman, because the chairman is the only person who gets to bring witnesses forward.

Then the gentleman talked about Trey Gowdy's committee, the Benghazi Select Committee. He tries to use that as the reference point for holding an impeachment inquiry.

Let's all be clear: Trey Gowdy's committee on Benghazi was a special select committee to find out what happened.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SCALISE. I will ultimately yield, but you mentioned all of these things, and so I want to clear up the things that the gentleman mentioned.

So the Trey Gowdy committee, where four Americans died and we were trying to get to the bottom of that—not to impeach anybody, but to find out how four Americans died when people should have known that there was danger over there and the proper precautions weren't taken. So he had a committee.

Do you know, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland, that Chairman Gowdy allowed the minority to call witnesses? He didn't sit there and say: Hey, I won and you lost, and so I can just roll over you and then back up the car again. That is not what Trey Gowdy did. He was the chairman, but he let the ranking member, the minority leader of the committee, call their witnesses.

That is not happening right now. Not one witness has been allowed by our side. Closed hearings to the public.

If this is something that you are so concerned about, if you are concerned about corruption, why root it out in secret, behind closed doors, with a one-sided set of rules that represents and reflects more how the Soviet Union would conduct something like this as opposed to how the United States of America has always conducted impeachment inquiries? We are talking about impeachment inquiries in secret, behind closed doors.

So, yes, the gentleman raised a lot of issues, and I wanted to go back to each of those.

So what we have asked for is the same fairness that has always been allowed, both sides—not just the winning side, both sides. This is America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What he didn't mention was the Benghazi Gowdy commission was the eighth Republican-led investigation of that matter. They all reached the same conclusion and found no evidence of wrongdoing; eight Republican-led, and they kept after it, over and over and over again.

Why? As the minority leader said, on television, well, no, we got something out of it. We got some dirt on Hillary Clinton.

I don't think it was dirt. It was the use of a computer which, by the way, some of the Trump family is doing the same thing—somewhat irrelevant.

What is relevant is not all this stuff about fairness and this, that, and the other. We are following the Constitution. We are following the rules of this House. We are following the law, and every legal scholar that I have read asserts that. The only people who don't assert that are the people who are afraid of the facts, afraid of what has been done.

I asked the gentleman questions: Do you think this is right? Do you think the President is above the law? He mentions the Mueller report.

What he fails to mention and he just ignores is the Mueller report said there was evidence to suggest that there was the failure to follow the law and cooperate with the law, in other words, obstruction of justice. But he said Justice Department rules, of which he was an employee, do not provide for the ability to indict a President of the United States. That did not mean that there wasn't obstruction of justice.

But what he said was this is the body to deal with this matter. So we are following our constitutional duty, and we are going to continue to do so, and there are going to be public hearings. There is going to be debate. There is going to be a vote on the rule if something is brought to the floor and full opportunity to debate on both sides of the aisle.

Right now, of course, there are members of the committee—you would think this was somehow Mr. SCHIFF and the Democrats meeting in some secret room. They are meeting with the Republican members of the committee.

And, by the way, I asked the gentleman the question about Mr. NUNES. But Mr. NUNES, apparently, comes sometimes and he doesn't come sometimes. And Mr. MEADOWS is apparently always there, so he can always tell you what is going on. This is an endless debate.

If the Republicans think we are violating the law, of course they can go to court, as we have been forced to do by this President who has instructed people not to cooperate with Congress, not to testify before the Congress because he feels aggrieved.

He will have his day in court. That is how we run these kinds of events in America: under our Constitution, under our laws. And, yes, he will have due process.

But right now we are trying to find out whether there is probable cause to believe the President of the United States committed high crimes and misdemeanors and abused the power of his office, as Hamilton said the purpose of the impeachment provision was designed to address. Hamilton said that in two of the Federalist Papers.

But we are going to endlessly talk about fairness, with Republicans sitting in the committee. He asserts, with no knowledge, that somehow the

Democratic members of the committee released this information.

I am not sure how the paper got this information. I know they get almost all the information on all these networks. But this was the testimony that was prepared by the witness who was there—who was there.

He talks about the whistleblower and hearsay, but what he doesn't talk about: Does he believe the President is above the law? Does he believe it is appropriate?

And the transcript—I could read it again. I keep saying "transcript." It is not a transcript. A report of the phone call that the President thought was okay, that is why he released it. He thought it was perfect.

In addition, he said: The other thing, there is a lot of talk about Biden's son, that Biden stopped the prosecutor, and a lot of people want to find out about that. So whatever you can do with the Attorney General—he wants his lawyer. It should be the Justice Department's lawyer, but Mr. BARR to participate. And, of course, he wanted Mr. Giuliani to participate as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude, we are going down this rat hole too long. We are going to have hearings. We are going to find out the truth, and we are finding out the truth every day, and every day our Republican colleagues get more nervous.

Every day there is some Republican who says: I don't know how long I can defend President Trump. Every day that is happening now, because the facts are coming out.

When you don't have the facts, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, you attack the process. Republicans know the facts aren't on their side. They can't answer the fundamental question: Is it acceptable for a President to seek foreign interference in elections?

They will say: Oh, there is no proof of that. And the problem they have is almost every day there is proof of that, not hearsay.

Yes, the whistleblower did the right thing. The whistleblower heard something that he felt was dangerous to our national security, to our men and women in uniform, and to the democracy that we hold so dear, and so he said something. You have seen the signs: You see something, say something. He heard this.

One could say, well, he didn't hear it, but then the President admitted it. Then the Chief of Staff, Acting Chief of Staff, Mr. Mulvaney, said, yes, that is what we did. And he instructed, don't get that money to the Ukrainians.

Those are facts. We know those are facts.

So I tell my friend, we really ought to conclude this. We believe we are following the law. If you don't feel we are following the law, go to court, just as we had to go to court with the President refusing to cooperate with the Congress of the United States in its constitutional duty.

□ 1915

And we are going to be fair, and I am sure the Senate will be fair if we take action here. And I don't know that we are going to take action. That hasn't been decided. But we are going to continue to try to find the truth, to try to get to the bottom of what has happened.

I, frankly, think what we did in Turkey in that Erdogan phone call is as damaging to the interests of the United States of America. And the President talks about the public. The public ought to know.

I want any Member of the Congress I will yield to to tell me what the deal was between Putin and Trump when they met in private and refused to tell anybody.

Mr. Trump is great at disclosure. He says, I have nothing to hide in my tax returns. I will show my tax returns. That was 3 years ago. We have, by law, requested those returns. It has been denied. It has been denied.

No openness. No, Mr. and Mrs. America, this is what my interests are. I am acting in your interests, not in mine. Doral. He decided that was too much, and Republicans criticized him.

And, Mr. Speaker, on Turkey we had a vote in this House. He was really angry about that vote. 354 people of this House said this is wrong, Mr. President, this is harmful to our allies. You are exposing allies that we asked to participate to confront terrorists. You are letting them out perhaps to be murdered and slaughtered. 354-to-60. We voted on that.

We need to deal with the facts. And we are going to find out the facts no matter how hard the Republicans want to pound on the table and talk about process and ignore any discussion on the substance of what is being disclosed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can conclude this colloquy because it is not going to come to any end. I understand the gentleman's perception. I think he is misrepresenting each time he says that this is not a fair procedure or that this is not a procedure consistent with the rules that the Republicans adopted in their rules package when they were in the majority.

So I hope that we can move on, decide what the facts are, have a committee recommendation as is the process of this House and then have a vote on the floor of the House, if such is required, and the committees decide that moving forward is appropriate under the facts adduced by those committees.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if we really are about getting to the facts, to think that you can suggest it is a fair process when only one side gets to choose who the witnesses are—again, the gentleman references Trey Gowdy's committee. Chairman Gowdy allowed both sides, Republican and Democrat, to bring forward witnesses because he wanted to get the facts. If you really wanted to get the facts, would the chairman of the committee, literally,

take the witness and run out of the room as soon as other voting Members of Congress showed up? That happened today.

If the chairman really wanted to get the facts out, would he literally close the meetings? Tell all Members, Republican and Democrat, not to go talk to the press. And then somebody mysteriously, selectively leaks things to the press that are negative, in many cases disputed by other testimony that was given in secret, so it can't get out. And so you get one side of the story.

I guess if you are okay with having only one side of a story told, that might be your prerogative because you are in the majority, but don't call that fair. It is clearly not fair if only one side gets to tell their story and the other side doesn't get to bring their witnesses.

The President who you are accusing of possibly committing some crime so high, high crime and misdemeanors is the standard, if you are accusing him of that, you can't lay it out yet, you are hoping and looking around for something, which isn't the process, by the way, that has been used in the past.

If you don't like the results of the election, there is an election next year. And if you don't trust the people of this country to make that decision, do you really go into a Star Chamber and run a Soviet-style set of hearings where only one side gets to tell their side of the story?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. SCALISE, watch your words. Watch your words, Mr. SCALISE. You and I both know it has no analogy to what you have just said. You ought to know that. If you don't know it, you ought to sit down with your counsel and find out about it. That is an allegation that is absolutely untrue and very offensive.

Mr. SCALISE. What is the allegation that is untrue?

Mr. HOYER. It is very offensive.

Mr. SCALISE. Who can call the witnesses? Just your side. You think it is fair that only you can call the witnesses, and then you want to get the truth? Are you going to get the facts when you shut out the other side? When you don't let the President have his own legal counsel there, like has always been done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. SCALISE, I know you are not a lawyer. Do you have any idea what a grand jury is?

Mr. SCALISE. This is not a grand jury. This is the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Of course it is.

Mr. SCALISE. If you want to run a grand jury, go get a jury.

This is the United States Congress. Voting Members of Congress are being shut out of the room, Mr. Speaker. Voting Members of Congress are being shut out of this process. You want to call that fair? Good luck. But it is not fair.

It is a one-sided process to create a document with a determined outcome. It is going to be a tainted document,

because it only tells one side of the story. The old saying is, a grand jury can indict a ham sandwich, if they want to. There is a reason for that because only one side can call witnesses.

When we have had impeachment inquiries in the past you don't have to reinvent the wheel. It has only happened three times. And in modern times they have used the exact same standard.

The standard is: Both sides get to call witnesses. That is not going on right now.

It was done in public. That is not being done right now.

It is going on in secret. The press can't go in. You can't go in. I can't go in, unless they run out with the witness.

That is not a fair process. Maybe that is the process that you want to conduct, but don't call it fair, because it is not.

And, ultimately, it is not going to result in a fair document that is going to be determining whether or not a President of the United States is impeached.

And Members of both sides, 75 percent of the Members of this body, Republican and Democrat, are going to be asked to cast a vote on something that they can't even go and determine and find out about. They can't sit in the hearings. They can't read the testimony. 230 million Americans are represented by those Members of Congress who cannot get access to what is going on in that room. Maybe you can get it from reading leaked press reports.

Is that really how you determine whether or not to impeach a President of the United States? That is not fair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I hesitate to respond because this is a circular discussion.

Mr. SCALISE and the Republican party, at the behest of Mr. Trump, need to get tougher. They can't mention the facts. The facts are known by the transcript the President sent down here. Again, not a transcript, a report of a telephone call, the statement of the ambassador, I think, a former U.S. marine.

They don't want to talk about the facts. I get that. So we can go around and around in circles.

And I will tell you, to have eight hearings on Benghazi? Don't give me this Trey Gowdy allowed this to happen and that to happen. It was the eighth hearing you Republicans had on that one subject, eight, and you never got the result you wanted, so you just kept doing it over and over and over. Getting the same result. We all know that quote.

There are going to be public hearings, Mr. Speaker, but they are going to be public hearings when the witnesses can't check one another, can't give one story and then parrot the other story that was said.

And Ambassador Sondland, of course. I don't know that he was our friend. He

was the President's friend, big contributor, special envoy to the European Union, but apparently doing part-time work in Ukraine along with Mr. Giuliani.

The facts are going to come out, Mr. Speaker. And they are going to try to say, oh, the process. You are going to have public hearings, Mr. SCHIFF has said so. He said so in his letter.

And you are going to have to answer the question: Do I believe that the conduct that has been pursued by the President of the United States, if he were a Democrat, would I believe that was right? That is the question you're going to have to answer. It is going to be a tough question for your side because the facts almost every day are mounting up.

So I want to urge my friend, let's conclude this discussion, because I am not going to agree with you, and you are not going to agree with me.

But ultimately the American people—and those 236 million people you talk about, there is not going to be any indictment, there is not going to be any impeachment, unless 218 of us in this body vote. And we are all going to vote. It is not going to be any Star Chamber. Everybody is going to have to vote.

And then they are going to have to answer to their constituents, did I vote my conscience, or did I vote my politics?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the gentleman is asserting that we will have a vote on impeachment, that might be breaking news, but if these Members, all of us, are going to vote on impeachment, shouldn't we be able to see what goes on? Shouldn't we be able to have access to the hearings? Shouldn't we be able to have access to the transcripts? Can we now?

I would ask the gentleman, would he release the transcripts now of these hearings so that Members can start preparing? So Members can know what they are going to vote on?

Are you going to keep it in secret and then drop something on the floor after it has been baked and predetermined what the outcome should be before Members really have an idea of what is going on in those rooms that are being denied entrance to those rooms right now? It has never happened before in other impeachment inquiries.

And you can say it is about process. It is about history.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't say that.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HOYER mocked that the process is tainted, that the process is being run like it might be run in the Soviet Union, not in the United States of America. It has never been done like that before.

And you talk about Trey Gowdy, as if we were looking around for something to impeach a President on. We weren't.

You had four Americans die. There are a lot of questions that still haven't

been answered about why those Americans died.

And all of us should be concerned about what happened at Benghazi. To ridicule the fact that there were eight hearings on something so alarming? Nobody was fishing around, looking—

By the way, we never tried to impeach the President over anything. All of the things that we disagreed with him on, none of those. Even times when he would sign executive orders that circumvented the law, and we would challenge him in the court, and we won a number of those court cases, but that doesn't mean it rose to the level of high crimes and misdemeanors. And so we never went down that road.

But maybe some, in some part of a base, want to see impeachment, no matter what. And some have said that. Some in your own party have said they just want to impeach the President because if they don't, he will get re-elected. That has been said by members of your party.

That is not why you impeach a President, because you think he is going to get re-elected. The American people make that determination next year.

We have had investigation after investigation. Again, Mueller alone had 2,800 subpoenas. He had the full authority to bring charges against the President on collusion, on obstruction. Even the Attorney General said that he had the authority to bring charges, but even if he did have those, he wouldn't have brought charges on obstruction, because there wasn't obstruction and there wasn't collusion. But he had full authority to bring charges on both fronts, and he didn't. But, again, 222 months of that meandering witch hunt to try to find something. And it wasn't found because it wasn't there.

And then you had the whistleblower, the so-called whistleblower. Who, if you are worried about who is talking to somebody to try to get their stories straight, interestingly, the whistleblower—who, again, was identified to be somebody with a political bias—went and met with Chairman SCHIFF's staff prior to filing the whistleblower complaint.

Yes, somebody did collude. Real interesting how that happened. Before the whistleblower complaint was filed, they actually sat down with the staff of the majority leader, Chairman SCHIFF, and lo and behold, you get a political document that comes out with allegations, disproven in many cases, but that is where we are. That is the basis for starting an impeachment inquiry.

That is not really an impeachment inquiry, because we are not following the same rules that have always been followed under an impeachment inquiry, but that is the genesis of this, and that is where we are.

□ 1930

And if that is what the document is going to ultimately yield, it will be a tainted document. But I guess if you

want to find an outcome—this isn't a grand jury. This is the United States House of Representatives, and there are 75 percent in this body who are going to be asked to vote on something that they cannot see, they cannot participate in, they have absolutely no access to. That is not what this country is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman keeps misstating the facts and the law and the process.

Every Member is going to have access to all the documents, all the testimony before they are asked to vote on it, period.

Mr. SCALISE. When?

Mr. HOYER. When they have concluded their private sessions, which are trying to get at the facts and not having been tainted by some circus. Everybody is going to have the right to see what evidence is adduced.

That is the fear, of course, and I again suggest the gentleman think of this: If he saw these headlines and it was a Democratic President and Turkey and Russia were deciding what is happening in the Middle East and deciding whether they are going to go after ISIS, our ally, and then this other headline replete with the aid to Ukraine was conditioned on a quid pro quo or they weren't going to be in the White House, they may not get the \$391 million, he would be outraged. He would be on this ceiling.

Mr. SCALISE. I would if it was true, but it is not.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, do I still have my time?

Mr. SCALISE. You can only read it in the press because of selective leaking. And so that is how Members of Congress are supposed to make a determination on impeachment of the President, based on selected leaks to the press?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman wasn't here during the Clinton impeachment with Starr. Starr might as well—

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, here is another headline: "Democrats Writing More Subpoenas Than Laws." That is a headline. That is what angers people who want to see their prescription drug prices lowered, but they can't because of this infatuation with impeachment. That is what is holding this country back. That is what is holding this House back from doing the people's work.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman has anything else. If not, I would be ready to yield back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### 150TH BIRTHDAY OF SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the city of Santa Ana's 150th birthday.

My hometown was founded on October 27, 1869, on just 70 acres of land in Orange County; and today, Santa Ana is the second largest city in Orange County.

It is home to veterans of World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, and the last few conflicts.

It is also home to the largest Hispanic population, percentagewise, in the country. It is essentially the new Ellis Island of the United States.

Congratulations to the city of Santa Ana on their 150 years. Congratulations to their constituents and to the council and to the mayor.

#### IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to think it is appropriate to conduct an impeachment inquiry behind closed doors, shutting out the American people.

They have denied Republican Members of Congress the right to fully participate in the inquiry process but expect them to cast a vote to impeach a duly elected President of the United States without seeing all the facts.

In addition to all that, Democrats denied us the right to vote on a resolution to censure Chairman SCHIFF for his deception of Americans day in and day out.

This morning, I joined dozens of my colleagues as we stormed into the SCIF demanding transparency, shedding light on this corrupt process. Instead of having a conversation, Chairman SCHIFF abruptly ended the deposition, taking the witness with him out of the room.

The Speaker of this House is putting her hatred of the President above what is best for her constituents. She is harming the entire Nation by conducting this inquiry in such a manner.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. We are better than this; our country is better than this; and the American people certainly deserve better than this. They deserve better than an impeachment inquiry in a secret room based on assertions of a phantom whistleblower.

#### TRIBUTE TO COLONEL TOM C. "IKE" MORRIS

(Mr. ROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a constituent of the 21st Congressional District of Texas. This man was a hero, veteran, and the oldest known graduate of Texas A&M University, the alma mater of my bride. His name was Colonel Tom C. "Ike" Morris.

Colonel Morris passed away Sunday in San Antonio at the age of 109 years old, leaving behind a life and legacy all of us can only aspire to someday.

Colonel Morris is the epitome of what the Greatest Generation embodied. He worked five jobs to stay in school during the Depression and graduated from Texas A&M with a bachelor's degree in agriculture.

Working his way through school didn't stop him from being an engaged member of the Aggie community. He was senior class president, chaired the committee that set the first requirements for seniors to earn the famous Aggie Ring, and was a member of the track and field team.

He also knew what it meant to fight for a man's right to live free. He fought in the 38th Infantry of the 2nd Infantry Division in World War II. He went on to land on Omaha Beach during the invasion of Normandy and, with his unit, he liberated the first city in France.

Colonel Morris married his high school sweetheart, and they were married for 77 years.

Colonel Morris celebrated his 109th birthday this August. When asked about the secret to living a long life, Colonel Morris said, "Do your best."

We could improve from adhering to such sage, simple advice.

Colonel Morris, we thank you for your service and for leading a life worthy of example. May you rest in peace now. God bless you, sir.

#### HONORING THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 241 MARINES LOST IN BEIRUT, LEBANON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the 241 American heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice on this very day 36 years ago in Beirut, Lebanon.

For my family and so many families, today is deeply emotional.

When I enlisted in 1979 as a young man, I wanted to serve and be part of something bigger. That led me to the United States Marine Corps and, like every marine, I took an oath to God, country, and to the Corps.

Semper fidelis is not just a slogan or a creed; it is a way of life that only those who have earned the eagle, globe, and anchor can fully understand. Semper fidelis is part of the very fabric of every marine, past and present.

I served as a first lieutenant in the 3rd Battalion, 3rd Marines. In 1983, my battalion was ordered to Beirut, Leb-

anon, in support of the 1st Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment and the 24th Marine Amphibious Unit.

I vividly remember the evenings we sat on the roof of the Marine barracks with the American flag flying over our head. The barrage of small arms gunfire and mortar rounds made it very clear that we were in harm's way every day.

On this very day 36 years ago, a terrorist affiliated with Hezbollah and financed by Iran drove a truck bomb into the barracks we called home.

241 American servicemen were killed, 220 of which were my fellow marines. 241 sons, brothers, fathers, and friends never returned home. 241 came in peace, and 241 lives were stolen from us by an act of absolute pure evil.

It was the deadliest day for the Marine Corps since the Battle of Iwo Jima.

It is by the grace of God that I was able to come home to my wife, Denise, who was expecting our first child. My battalion had shipped out 10 days before the bombing.

Mr. Speaker, today is not about me. People may not recognize the 241 names listed here, but they are the names of the 241 who answered the call of duty 36 years ago.

Today is about those 241 soldiers, sailors, and marines who laid down their lives to protect our freedoms, and today is about every veteran who has nobly worn the uniform of our Armed Forces.

On this somber day, I look out at the flag flying above the U.S. Capitol and feel the same reverence I felt standing below the Stars and Stripes on the roof of the Beirut barracks in 1983. Though I will never know exactly why I was spared when so many were not, I understand that our first duty is to remember and be faithful.

Mr. Speaker, three of my fellow marines, Representatives GALLAGHER, CARBAJAL, and MOULTON, joined me to offer legislation to remember the faith and loyalty of the 241.

Fellow marine, Representative GALLEGOS, joined me to offer legislation to provide a sliver of justice for the Gold Star families who lost their loved ones. Our bill, the OORAH Act, passed both the House and Senate, and for that I am very grateful.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is still work to be done here. Terrorists and those who support them financially must be held accountable for their terrible actions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for participating in this Special Order to remember the sacrifice of those who answered the call of duty to defend our freedom in conflicts across the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), my fellow Hoosier and decorated Vietnam veteran.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.



Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague in remembering the 36th anniversary of the appalling terrorist attack on American troops stationed in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23, 1983.

This horrific attack took the lives of 241 U.S. troops and injured countless others. This incident marked the highest single-day death toll for the United States Marine Corps since the Battle of Iwo Jima.

My friend and fellow Hoosier, GREG PENCE, was stationed in Beirut just 10 days before the terrorist attack and lost many fellow marines in the bombing.

Here with us today, seated in the gallery, are a few of the Gold Star families who lost their loved ones and family members on that fateful day.

Mr. Speaker, freedom truly is not free, and I thank them for their sacrifice and pay tribute to the brave servicemembers who paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend and protect the United States of America.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my friend and colleague.

□ 1945

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in honor of those who lost their lives in the Beirut terrorist attacks.

The men and women of our Armed Forces are true American heroes. They demonstrate bravery, courage, and an unmatched sense of duty to us all. They fight each day to preserve our great Nation and defend us from enemies we can and cannot see.

Our veterans have fought for our independence and liberty countless times throughout our history. They have fought off tyranny to defend freedom around the world. They have defended the innocent who cannot defend themselves. They have worked to preserve peace for all. Because of them, we are here in this Chamber today. And because of them, our Star-Spangled Banner waves proudly above.

This is what the valiant men and women were doing in Beirut in 1983. They were part of an important peace-keeping mission when Lebanon was facing a violent civil war.

In a single moment, 220 marines, 18 sailors, and 3 soldiers lost their lives, and 128 Americans were wounded.

Two hundred and forty-one Americans gave their lives that day. This was the largest number of casualties lost in one day since the Tet Offensive in the Vietnam war. This event is one of the darkest in our history.

As a wife, a mother, and a grandmother, I cannot imagine the pain 241 families have endured since that fateful day 36 years ago.

Today, I would like to honor those who made the ultimate sacrifice in Beirut, for their fearless service and for working toward the more peaceful world that we all want. They will never be forgotten.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), my friend, colleague, and fellow marine.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, colleague, and fellow marine, GREG PENCE, for the honor to speak before this body tonight on such a—you don't call an occasion like this important, but I think we call it relevant.

It is relevant because Marines, for a long time, since 1775, have fought to defend freedom, and we go to the fight to win, but we also go to the fight to help others.

On Sunday, 23 October 1983, you have heard the story told already, how 220 marines, 18 sailors, and 3 soldiers lost their lives when a terrorist's truck bomb exploded at a barracks compound in Beirut, Lebanon.

The same day, 58 of our French brothers in arms lost their lives in an additional attack by Hezbollah.

In what would be the deadliest day for the Marine Corps since the battle of Iwo Jima, seven of the marines and sailors were Michiganders, including Lance Corporal David Bousum of Fife Lake, Michigan.

I remember that day very vividly. At the time, I was a KC-130 pilot stationed at Naval Air Station Glenview, Illinois, flying the KC-130 refuelers. We used to fly all around the world, in and out of the Middle East doing our mission.

Five days after the bombing was the annual Marine Corps Birthday Ball for our unit and our greater Chicago marines. And that year, we had as our guest of honor then-Major General Al Gray, commander of the 2nd Marine Division, who a couple years after that became the commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Marines are full of tradition and pageantry. And I will tell you what, the only thing we do more than celebrate, is grieve. And of the roughly 50 years of birthday balls that I have attended, that one was heavy with grief. We had lost our brothers through a heinous act, and a cowardly act. It took us a while to get over it at that time, but, in the end, you really never get over it. All you do is set your course for the future fight to make sure that that does not happen again.

The loss of life will always have an impact on our entire armed services community and our Nation. Our mission, as the Marine Corps, is to be the most ready when the Nation is least ready, and we will always be that, whether it be in the 1770s or in the 2070s and beyond.

Today, we honor the fallen, we honor their lives, their legacies, and their families.

We will never forget the sacrifices made by Michigan's own that day. We lost the following warriors, marines, and sailors:

Lance Corporal David Bousum from Fife Lake

Lance Corporal Johansen Banks from Detroit

Sergeant Anthony K. Brown from Detroit

Hospital Corpsman 2 Michael H. Johnson from Detroit

Sergeant Michael R. Massman from Port Huron

Sergeant William H. Pollard from Flint

First Lieutenant William A. Zimmerman from Grand Haven

We will never forget.

In the Marines' Hymn, the third stanza ends with: "If the Army and the Navy ever look on Heaven's scenes, they will find the streets are guarded by United States Marines."

I would suggest to you that some of those marines are on duty today. We honor their service, we honor their sacrifice, and we honor our country by remembering. God bless you all and Semper Fidelis.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends, colleagues, and distinguished guests in the gallery for their participation in my Special Order.

As a Beirut veteran, I am deeply moved by their remarks, and I know their words will comfort the Gold Star Families across this Nation.

Today, on the 36th anniversary of this horrific attack, and every day, we must strive to ensure that all are remembered, and all are honored. We remember their loyalty, their selflessness, and their courage. We are humbled by their tremendous sacrifice.

We must hold them closely in our hearts and hometowns. We must live in gratitude for the precious gift they have given to us here today.

Most of all, we must uphold our promise to honor our fallen. We must remain always faithful.

Mr. Speaker, I will always remain faithful. God bless America, and Semper Fi.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the morning of October 22, 1983, a suicide bomber drove a truck full of explosives into a Marine compound in Beirut, Lebanon, killing 241 U.S. service members. This was the deadliest attack against our U.S. Marines since Iwo Jima.

These Marines were stationed in Beirut to assist with the Palestinian withdrawal during the Lebanese civil war—they were protecting those who were being persecuted and fought to keep peace in the area.

There is a memorial at Camp Lejeune for those who lost their lives that day and it reads, "They came in Peace." I do not think I could say it any better. Our service men and women go overseas to ensure war does not reach our shores. They selflessly put aside their fears, and without hesitation say bravely, "I will serve, send me."

Some may know that my dear friend, Congressman GREG PENCE, was serving that day in Beirut. I am thankful that my friend's life was spared on that day.

For those who perished that day we will never forget your ultimate sacrifice to your country. Of those who passed away, eight were from Texas:

Leland E. Gann, Matilde Hernandez Jr. and Timothy R. McMahon from Austin; Rodolfo

Hernandez from El Paso; Michael S. Fulton from Ft. Worth; Marcus E. Coleman from Dallas; Johnnie D. Caesar from El Campo; and David W. Brown from Conroe.

We must never forget this day and those who were murdered because of what the freedoms they believed in so fiercely they were willing to put their life on line.

#### TRIBUTE TO LEON G. FELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to tell a remarkable story of the unacknowledged patriotism and heroism of a 23-year-old Army scout, who, on December 3, 1944, was immersed in the horror and peril of some of the worst of the fighting in the bloody nightmare of the Philippines campaign. At Mount Cabuganan, Technician 5th Class Leon G. Felt heroically engaged the enemy.

His family keeps the steel helmet he wore that day. The back half of that helmet is riddled with shrapnel holes from the inside out. A grenade exploded beneath him, and the deadly shrapnel blew up his left side, blowing off his helmet from below with enough force to pierce it.

Now, Leon never talked much about what happened that day. The war ended, and he came home after months in Army hospitals dealing with his grave injuries. The only thing his family really knew, years later, was a brief entry in his journal. It said, "Lieutenant Hanna told me he put me in for a Silver Star for what I did in the attack," but nothing came of it.

His wife told me that the Army's final orders to Leon and his comrades were: go home, get a job, look after your families. Well, that is exactly what Leon Felt did. He joined the Southern Pacific Railroad, ultimately retiring as a shop foreman. He became deeply involved in his church. He married Lois Wade, his wife of 32 years, until she died in 1976. He then married Nola Pulsipher, who survives him after 42 years of marriage. He raised eight children and today has 41 grandchildren, 110 great-grandchildren with three more on the way, and seven great-great-grandchildren.

The war never left him. Nola says she would often rescue him from his frequent nightmares, and all he could say through his tears was, "It's either kill or be killed." His children only knew that he was in the thick of the war, that he had come home wounded, and that those days in the Philippines still haunted him.

In recent years, Leon's family began looking into his service record. Having read his journal, his daughter, Lydean, began searching for what he did that day that would have rated a recommendation for the Silver Star. They had ordered copies of his medals, but there was no mention of a Silver Star

in them. He had received the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, among other decorations.

But Lydean remained curious about that entry in his diary, and what seemed to be a confusing note on one Army form that suggested there might be something more, though there was no official record of it. Now, Lydean, who has all of the timidity of a heat-seeking missile, wouldn't give up. She wrote the National Personnel and Record Center of the National Archives. The Archives could find no record of other medals, including the Silver Star. A fire in 1973, they feared, would have destroyed any record if he had. But Lydean persisted.

The archives kept digging, and then they stumbled upon a curious thing: a collection of citations of the most heroic deeds of World War II. In it, they found the citation for Leon G. Felt and what he did that December day in 1944. They were right about one thing: he was never awarded the Silver Star.

On February 12, 1945, as he lay recovering from his wounds in an Army hospital, Leon Felt had been awarded the Nation's second highest honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, revered more than any other medal, but the Medal of Honor itself. But somewhere along the way, probably because of a clerical error, his service record was never updated, and word never reached him.

Now, here are the words that were supposed to have been spoken as he received our Nation's second highest military honor:

"Technician Fifth Grade Leon G. Felt, Serial Number 39902244, Cavalry, United States Army. For extraordinary heroism against the enemy at Mount Cabuganan, Leyte, Philippine Islands, on 3 December 1944.

"Advancing through very rugged terrain, his troop encountered the enemy entrenched in a strong position astride a narrow ridge. The enemy were well dug in, their rifle pits being concealed with top coverings of brush and grass. During an attack by our troops, the advance of the right platoon was temporarily diverted by heavy enemy fire, but upon receiving reinforcing fire from the left platoon, the intensity of the enemy fire slackened. Seizing this opportunity, Technician Felt, a scout for his platoon, voluntarily rushed the nearest enemy rifle pit, and grasping the top cover, stripped it off, exposing three occupants whom he killed. Continuing his advance, he reached and uncovered a second pit and killed three more enemy. He then advanced toward a third pit but was struck and wounded by the fragments from an exploding hand grenade.

□ 2000

"Despite his wound and the warning shouts of his comrades, he continued to push his attack, and reaching the foxhole, killed its two occupants. Unable to advance farther because of his wounds, he from his advanced position directed the attack of his platoon upon

remaining enemy within the position. This attack was successful, and the enemy were driven from the position with heavy losses.

"Technician Felt's prompt, heroic actions in voluntarily attacking the enemy single-handedly were an inspiration to his comrades and reflect the highest traditions of the United States Army. By command of General MacArthur."

Long ago, soldiers coined the term "snafu" to describe the military bureaucracy. It is an acronym that, roughly translated, means, "Situation Normal—All Fouled Up."

Well, in a terrible snafu, the medal was never given to Technician Felt. He was never told of how grateful his country was for the sacrifices he made, for the bravery that saved the soldiers in his unit, and for the exemplary heroism and leadership that turned the tide of battle.

His family arranged to surprise him with this long-overdue presentation about 3 weeks ago on October 5. This was the Saturday before his 98th birthday. They gathered from across the country. They decorated the house and made a cake.

I have never been more honored or more moved than to have been asked to fulfill that long-overdue presentation that General MacArthur had ordered so long ago.

On my way to meet this gentle giant, as his family called him, I received word that Leon Felt had passed away in the early hours of that morning, surrounded by his loving family. But they were still gathered at the house, in grief now as well as pride, and so I made the presentation posthumously to his widow, an extraordinary woman in her own right.

There is some consolation in this story. As his health began slipping in the days before he died, his family told him that he had been awarded the Nation's second-highest military honor and that he was about to receive it at his birthday celebration.

Mrs. Felt told me that his face brightened up, and he said, "So, I really am your hero." And his wife replied, "That is what I have been telling you all these years."

The tragedy is that this honor should have followed Leon Felt throughout his life, as Shakespeare said, to "remember, with advantage, what feats he did that day." He should have been feasted and feted, and thanked every day of his life, as this honor spoke of his courageous deeds.

Instead of feeling guilt, he should have felt pride. For every nightmare he suffered alone, he should have enjoyed the gratitude of his fellow citizens. Instead, Technician Leon Felt, a recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross that he never received, did what he was told, quietly went home, got a job, and looked after his family.

His memorial service will be held in Dixon, California, tomorrow, and he will be buried with full military honors

at the Sacramento Valley National Cemetery. He will take to his grave pieces of shrapnel from the injuries he sustained at Mount Cabunganan. He will also take the Distinguished Service Cross that he was supposed to have been awarded 74 years ago.

I want to say to his family on behalf of our country that this long-missing medal now attests that the American people finally know what the Felt family has known all along, that he really was and is our Nation's hero, too.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to tell this story tonight, not for Leon Felt's sake, but for our country's sake, to remind

us what we owe heroes like him for the sacrifices often unrecognized and unrequited that they have made, to answer James Michener's haunting question: "Where do we get such men?"—and also to place in the RECORD in these hallowed Halls an apology, really, for a 74-year-old clerical mistake, a snafu that prevented him from knowing in life the gratitude and respect that our Nation can now express only after his death.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence to honor the memory of Technician Fifth Grade

Leon Gustave Felt, United States Army, recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 24, 2019, at 9 a.m.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 4 AND SEPT. 8, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Nancy Pelosi .....	9/5	9/8	France .....		2,418.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				2,418.00
Wyndee Parker .....	9/5	9/8	France .....		1,526.00		1,034.50				2,560.50
Terri McCullough .....	9/5	9/8	France .....		1,526.00		1,034.50				2,560.50
Kate Knudson .....	9/5	9/8	France .....		1,526.00		1,034.50				2,560.50
Dr. Brian Monahan .....	9/5	9/8	France .....		1,526.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				2,560.50
Committee total .....					8,522.00		3,103.50				11,625.50

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Oct. 7, 2019.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

#### HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JERROLD NADLER, Oct. 15, 2019.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Amata Radewagen .....	6/28	6/30	Switzerland .....		1,151.03				493.74		1,644.77
	6/30	7/4	Israel .....		2,106.00				967.46		3,073.46
	7/4	7/6	Qatar .....		769.05				206.65		975.70
	7/6	7/7	Cyprus .....		585.11				591.01		1,176.12
	7/7	7/7	Greece .....		257.00				39.20		296.20
Sarah Lim .....	8/15	8/29	Switzerland .....		4,332.91		2,462.13				6,795.04
Kenneth Degenfelder .....	7/26	7/31	Micronesia .....		328.00		2,750.09				3,078.09
Brian Modeste .....	7/26	7/31	Micronesia .....		328.00		2,450.09				2,778.09
Committee total .....					9,857.10		7,662.31		2,298.06		19,817.47

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, Oct. 11, 2019.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

#### HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Oct. 8, 2019.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Oct. 8, 2019.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN APRIL 1 AND JUNE 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL, Oct. 3, 2019.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL, Oct. 3, 2019.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2734. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the last grade Major General Lee K. Levy II, United States Air Force, served satisfactorily, before retirement, was major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2735. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Credit Union Bylaws (RIN: 3313-AE86) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2736. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Supervisory Committee Audits and Verifications (RIN: 3133-AE91) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2737. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds [Release No.: BHCA-7; File no.: S7-14-18] (RIN: 3235-AM10) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2738. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air

Regulations; Consistency Update for Virginia [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0140; FRL-9999-40-Region 3] October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2739. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0290; FRL-10001-21-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT25) received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2740. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arkansas; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 1-Hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS [EPA-R06-OAR-2019-0438; FRL-10000-92-Region 6] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2741. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Philadelphia County Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0082; FRL-10001-46-Region 3] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2742. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Correction Due to Vacatur of Revi-

sions to Implement the Revocation of the 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Final Rule [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0382; FRL-10001-45-Region 3] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2743. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio and West Virginia; Attainment Plans for the Steubenville, Ohio-West Virginia 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0044; EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0699; FRL-10001-26-Region 5] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2744. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; ID; Update to CRB Fee Billing Procedures [EPA-R10-OAR-2019-0403; FRL-10001-24-Region 10] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List [Docket No.: 190925-0044] (RIN: 0694-AH68) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2746. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Hook-and-Line Catcher/Processors in the Central

Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG869) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2747. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG591) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2748. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XF292) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2749. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XY039) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2750. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Gulf of Mexico, Fort Myers Beach, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0602] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2751. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; Patapsco River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0571] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2752. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Manasquan Inlet, Manasquan, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0799] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2753. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Voluntary State Tax Withholding From Retired Pay [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0012] (RIN: 0790-AK19) received October 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 4801. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Healthy Start program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 4802. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

H.R. 4803. A bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4804. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit the taking for a trophy of any endangered or threatened species of fish or wildlife in the United States and the importation of endangered and threatened species trophies into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 4805. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for interest on certain small business loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4806. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize the debarment of certain registrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4807. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who served honorably during the Cold War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 4808. A bill to require Community Development Block Grant and Surface Transportation Block Grant recipients to develop a strategy to support inclusive zoning policies, to allow for a credit to support housing affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. Rouda, Ms. PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. POSTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. ESPAILLART):

H.R. 4809. A bill to require the White House and each agency to provide an official website in the five most commonly used languages in the United States other than English as determined by the Census data and any other languages determined to be appropriate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 4810. A bill to facilitate responsible, informed dispensing of controlled substances and other prescribed medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4811. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a definition of short-term limited duration insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the modification, transfer, and termination of a registration to manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substances or list I chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 4813. A bill to prohibit large platform utilities from being a financial institution or being affiliated with a person that is a financial institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 4814. A bill to improve reporting of the distribution of controlled substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 4815. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to modify provisions relating to whistleblower incentives and protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CROW, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOST, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MAST, Mr. CASE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAMB, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BACON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. LURIA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. MILLER, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4817. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 4818. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of certain vessels for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to allow States to use funding provided under the surface transportation block grant program and the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program to develop and implement vision zero plans in eligible localities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to provide assistance to manage farmer and rancher stress and for the mental health of individuals in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASE, Mr. SABLÁN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 4821. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of Cali-

fornia, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4822. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high-quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHERSTER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4823. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to revise the policy of the Agency to address the threats of climate change, to include considerations of climate change in the strategic plan of the Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4824. A bill to reauthorize the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011, to provide assistance to small businesses owned by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, Science, Space, and Technology, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the secure storage of a licensed firearm possessed by a Federal judge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 4826. A bill to award career pathways innovation grants to local educational agencies and consortia of local educational agencies, to provide technical assistance within the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education to administer the grants and support the local educational agencies with the preparation of grant applications and management of grant funds, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to enhance age-friendly communities for older individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act with respect to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 4829. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the 50 percent limitation on the deduction for meal expenses does not apply to meals provided on certain fishing boats or at certain fish processing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 4830. A bill to provide payment for patient navigator services under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 4831. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish pilot programs to assist low-income households in maintaining access to sanitation services and drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 4833. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a grant program for multigenerational collaboration; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an exception to the definition of an off-campus outpatient department of a provider under the Medicare program for certain departments of a provider if such provider was forced to relocate its campus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 4835. A bill to provide grants to improve trauma support services and mental health care for children and youth in educational settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 4836. A bill to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives by investing in effective violence reduction initiatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 4837. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from using funds for grants related to the history of wine in countries outside of the United States, whether insects are attracted to artificial light, or the levels of



stress on humans when discussing politics in social situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 4838. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow payments under the Medicare program for certain items and services furnished by off-campus outpatient departments of a provider to be determined under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4839. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to provide for the placement of a foster child in a cottage home, and to make a child so placed eligible for foster care maintenance payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 4840. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4841. A bill to require the prudential banking regulators to provide annual testimony to Congress on their supervision and regulation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. HAGEDORN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. OLSON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 4842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to provide funds for a United States pavilion at Expo 2020 Dubai, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4843. A bill to authorize the Susan Harwood Training Grant Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4844. A bill to remove the authorized purpose of maintaining water supply for agricultural uses for the project for Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 4845. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the National Lighthouse Center and Museum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide priority for the senior community service employment program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4847. A bill to establish a United States Global Health Commission and a United States Global Health Attaché Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Armed Services, for a period to

be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for educational assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4850. A bill to provide for certain additional requirements with respect to patent disclosures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to carry out a State workforce incentive program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make available to veterans certain additional information about post-secondary educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to eliminate the percentage cap on funding available to carry out the program to provide support services to older caregivers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to update and improve eligibility criteria for the Social Security Disability Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.J. Res. 78. A joint resolution expressing support for freedom of conscience; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Portland Trail Blazers on the 50th anniversary of their inaugural season; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CORREA:

H. Res. 652. A resolution honoring the city of Santa Ana's 150th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr.

TAKANO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H. Res. 653. A resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and supporting the designation of October 2019 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 4805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 4807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 4808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 4809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 4813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 4815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 4816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 4817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce. In addition, Congress has the power to make all Laws necessary and proper to carry out all other of its vested powers pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause VII

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 4820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 4825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 gives Congress the authority to make all needful Rules and regulations respecting US Territory.

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 4826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 4827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 4828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and wit the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 4833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitu-

tion in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 4835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 4836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 4837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 4838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states: "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for . . . the general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 4840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 18

"The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 4843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 4845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

By Ms. SCANLON:  
H.R. 4846.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1 Section 8  
By Mr. SHERMAN:  
H.R. 4847.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18  
By Mr. SIREs:  
H.R. 4848.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.  
By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:  
H.R. 4849.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.  
By Ms. SPANBERGER:  
H.R. 4850.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18  
By Ms. STEFANIK:  
H.R. 4851.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States  
By Mrs. TORRES of California:  
H.R. 4852.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.  
Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.  
By Mrs. TRAHAN:  
H.R. 4853.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18  
By Mr. YOHO:  
H.R. 4854.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8  
By Mr. BANKS:  
H.J. Res. 78.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

---

**ADDITIONAL SPONSORS**

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:  
H.R. 51: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 94: Mr. CROW.  
H.R. 129: Mr. MULLIN.  
H.R. 141: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 144: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.  
H.R. 217: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 451: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 463: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 478: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.  
H.R. 535: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 613: Mr. DELGADO.  
H.R. 625: Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 649: Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 671: Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 712: Ms. WILD.  
H.R. 737: Mr. EVANS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. GAETZ.  
H.R. 777: Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TAYLOR.  
H.R. 847: Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 865: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
H.R. 884: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.  
H.R. 895: Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 921: Mr. VELA.  
H.R. 934: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 935: Mr. TRONE and Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 945: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. SLOTKIN.  
H.R. 960: Mr. DELGADO.  
H.R. 961: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. GOMEZ.  
H.R. 991: Mr. BACON and Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 1002: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. MENG, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. ESCOBAR.  
H.R. 1007: Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 1025: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. HAALAND.  
H.R. 1078: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.  
H.R. 1108: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.  
H.R. 1142: Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 1224: Ms. PORTER, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KIM, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
H.R. 1230: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 1243: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 1309: Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
H.R. 1315: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 1341: Mr. STEUBE.  
H.R. 1345: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.  
H.R. 1379: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. STANTON.  
H.R. 1380: Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 1394: Mrs. FLETCHER.  
H.R. 1407: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. STEIL.  
H.R. 1446: Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 1497: Ms. TLAIB.  
H.R. 1498: Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H.R. 1528: Mrs. MILLER.  
H.R. 1529: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1570: Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
H.R. 1601: Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 1636: Ms. BARRAGAN.  
H.R. 1643: Mr. SIREs.  
H.R. 1646: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 1652: Mr. SOTO and Ms. GABBARD.  
H.R. 1680: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 1692: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1695: Mr. STAUBER.  
H.R. 1713: Mr. COX of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
H.R. 1717: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
H.R. 1765: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 1766: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TURNER, and Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 1774: Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 1777: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 1794: Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mrs. FLETCHER.  
H.R. 1865: Mrs. ROBY and Ms. FRANKEL.  
H.R. 1866: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1869: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 1882: Ms. SANCHEZ.  
H.R. 1903: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 2128: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 2135: Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 2146: Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2147: Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.  
H.R. 2179: Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 2191: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2201: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 2207: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. SPANBERGER.  
H.R. 2214: Mr. KIM, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. MCEACHIN.  
H.R. 2235: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 2256: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 2258: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. BUDD.  
H.R. 2279: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. KIND, Mr. SMUCKER, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
H.R. 2282: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 2311: Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 2349: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H.R. 2411: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.  
H.R. 2415: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 2420: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 2431: Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2435: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 2438: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 2442: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 2478: Mr. COX of California.  
H.R. 2487: Mr. STEUBE.  
H.R. 2521: Mr. WALDEN and Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 2540: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2584: Mr. KILMER, Mr. BOST, and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 2628: Mr. SPANO.  
H.R. 2645: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. STEUBE, and Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 2650: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2683: Mr. SIREs.  
H.R. 2694: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Ms. HILL of California.  
H.R. 2734: Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 2747: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. CISNEROS.  
H.R. 2767: Mr. CISNEROS.  
H.R. 2772: Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 2802: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MAST, and Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 2808: Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 2812: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 2818: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. FINKENAUER.  
H.R. 2825: Ms. WILD and Mr. HILL of Arkansas.  
H.R. 2831: Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 2913: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 2932: Mr. TAYLOR.  
H.R. 2986: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 2989: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 2990: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 3038: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 3068: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 3073: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 3077: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3078: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3085: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3103: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 3127: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 3128: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 3129: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3131: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 3165: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 3182: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 3219: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 3222: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3225: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3265: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3355: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3373: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3374: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3463: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3473: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3495: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 3502: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3513: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3524: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3529: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3559: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3588: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3632: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3665: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3668: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3708: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3760: Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3787: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 3794: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3815: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3820: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 3822: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3870: Mr. REED.

H.R. 3896: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CRIST, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3934: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 3956: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3957: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3960: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3973: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 4037: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 4051: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4096: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4098: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 4105: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4162: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 4228: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 4230: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4237: Mr. WALKER and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 4269: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4279: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4297: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4300: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 4303: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 4304: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 4305: Mr. REED, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 4319: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 4333: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4334: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 4348: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 4374: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4386: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4397: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4399: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4482: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4487: Mr. COX of California and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 4560: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4584: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4588: Mr. SOTO and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4589: Mr. STAUBER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 4615: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 4623: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4639: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4650: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 4670: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4674: Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 4678: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 4686: Mr. SIRES and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 4691: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4695: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BASS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4700: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4701: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 4705: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 4724: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 4736: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 4737: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 4739: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 4753: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 4754: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 4758: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 4764: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 4779: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4782: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4794: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. LEWIS.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 49: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 230: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 255: Mr. COOK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 296: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 410: Mr. SIRES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BERA, and Ms. WILD.

H. Res. 515: Mrs. LURIA.

H. Res. 520: Mr. CRIST and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 531: Ms. BASS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 538: Mr. MITCHELL.

H. Res. 546: Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. WILD, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. BERA.

H. Res. 574: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 620: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Res. 633: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 636: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 639: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of the City of New York, relative to Resolution No. 1047, calling on the United States Congress to pass, and the President to sign, legislation that would prohibit the enactment of the federal rule entitled, "Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

57. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of New York, relative to Resolution No. 866-A, calling on the United States Congress to re-introduce and pass, and the President to sign, the 3-D Firearms Prohibition Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.